

60. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Peter Poulson and others, Grand Avenue Junior High School, Bellmore, Long Island, N.Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting that the electoral college be nullified by an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and that it be replaced with a system utilizing the popular vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 4, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rev. Alfred O. Fuerbringer, D.D., president, Concordia Theological Seminary, St. Louis, Mo., offered the following prayer:

In the name of God, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Amen.

Eternal and almighty God, creator and preserver of the universe and all that it contains, ruler of all the peoples of the earth: Since Thou hast given us this good land for our heritage and dwelling place, we humbly ask Thee to guide us so that we may always prove ourselves a people mindful of Thy favors and glad to do Thy will. Forgive, we implore Thee, our many shortcomings as individuals and as a nation. Purify our hearts to see and love the truth. Help us to overcome our inclination to selfishness and the prejudices which hinder the welfare of our fellow men.

Bless our land with sound learning, honorable industry, useful arts, and good manners. Save us from violence, discord, and strife. Keep us from pride, arrogance, and every evil way. Preserve our liberties and prosper our endeavors to fashion and keep as one united people the multitudes who claim this country as their own.

Endue with the spirit of wisdom all those to whom we have, in Thy name, entrusted the privilege and the responsibility of government, that they may plan and do what is right, and that justice and peace may be preserved throughout our land. Help us to observe Thy ways and to show forth Thy praise to all the nations of the earth. Teach us to be sincere in our dealings with our allies and our opponents, and incline the hearts of men everywhere to mutual confidence and to a genuine desire for equity and peace.

To Thy especial care we commend all those who are in suffering or want, who are deprived of their rights or their freedom, or who are in any kind of danger. Sustain them with Thy power, and deliver them by Thy might.

In the days of prosperity, fill our hearts with gratitude; and in time of trouble, do not let us lose our confidence in Thee and Thy sure help. All of this we ask through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the

Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 1, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REPORT OF NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 78)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, I transmit herewith a report on the projects and progress of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the period of January 1 through June 30, 1962. This is the seventh of these reports since the passage of the legislation establishing that agency.

This report covers a period of acceleration in the national space program and reveals the significant role of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in that progress. Congressional support and interagency cooperation have contributed substantially to this record of space and aeronautics performance.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 4, 1963.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES CARRIED ON UNDER PUBLIC LAW 480, 83D CONGRESS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 79)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the seventeenth semiannual report on activities carried on under Public Law 480, 83d Congress, as amended, outlining operations under the act during the period July 1 through December 31, 1962.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 4, 1963.

CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on

the District of Columbia was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the new reports.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the new reports, will be stated.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John Harold Fanning, of Rhode Island, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of 5 years expiring December 16, 1967.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Dr. Francis Keppel, of Massachusetts, to be Commissioner of Education.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

LABOR DEPARTMENT

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Daniel Patrick Moynihan, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Howard G. Gamser, of New York, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring February 1, 1966.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of George C. Trevor, of Maryland, to

be a member of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review for the remainder of the term expiring July 15, 1965.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all the nominations which have been confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its session today, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon, Thursday next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONSIDERATION ON THURSDAY OF OUTDOOR RECREATION BILL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I wish to state that, at the request of a Senator, Senate bill 20, to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes, will not be taken up today, but will be taken up Thursday next.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF OFFICE OF CIVIL DEFENSE ON PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS OF EMERGENCY SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Office of Civil Defense on property acquisitions of emergency supplies and equipment, for the quarter ended December 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXTENSION OF PROVISIONS OF SECTION 3 OF PUBLIC LAW 87-346, RELATING TO DUAL RATE CONTRACTS

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 87-346, relating to dual rate contracts (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

PAYMENT OF CERTAIN RELOCATION COSTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to pay relocation costs made necessary by actions of the District of Columbia government, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT ON IMPROVIDENT DISPOSALS OF CRANE SHOVELS AND UNNECESSARY PROCUREMENT OF OUTBOARD MOTORS UNDER A MODERNIZATION PROGRAM OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on improvident disposals of crane shovels and unnecessary procurement of outboard motors under a modernization program of the Department of the Army, dated February 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT AND CERTIFICATION OF ECONOMIC JUSTIFICATION ON THE CRYSTAL DAM, RESERVOIR, AND POWERPLANT, COLORADO

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a supplemental report and certification of economic justification on the Crystal Dam, Reservoir, and powerplant, which comprise a segment of the Curecenti unit, Colorado River storage project, Colorado (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 2455 OF THE REVISED STATUTES, AS AMENDED (43 U.S.C. 1171)

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 2455 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (43 U.S.C. 1171), and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT ON NEGOTIATED CONTRACTS MADE FOR THE DISPOSAL OF MATERIALS

A letter from the Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Bureau on negotiated contracts made for the disposal of materials, for the period September 25 through December 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION ON CERTAIN CIVILIAN POSITIONS

A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on certain civilian positions in that Administration, for the calendar year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to au-

thorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 15

"Whereas the expanding economy and growing population of these United States make ever increasing demands upon available water resources and require vast quantities of water of high quality; and

"Whereas it has been recognized that a greatly expanded program of research, investigations, experiments, and studies relating to the prevention and control of water pollution is necessary to keep pace with the need of providing adequate supplies of water of high quality; and

"Whereas the scope and magnitude of water quality research problems vary widely from region to region so that the best means of coping with these problems is to conduct research at a regional level; and

"Whereas research on water pollution control directed to the specific problems in the State of Washington is very necessary, and many aspects of Washington's economy are dependent upon sound development of the State's water resources, and if economic growth is to proceed within the State it is necessary to have a much greater understanding of how to cope with the many emerging problems of water pollution; and

"Whereas provision has been made under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act for the construction of a Pacific Northwest regional field laboratory and research facility at Corvallis, Oreg., to assist in the solution of the many complex problems which affect water resources in the Pacific Northwest: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the President of the United States do include in the President's budget for fiscal year 1964, adequate funds to initiate research on an advance basis during fiscal year 1964, and that the President of the United States do encourage and the Congress assure that the funding requirements for the Pacific Northwest regional water pollution laboratory at Corvallis, Oreg., receive adequate attention in the preparation of the budget and in the appropriation processes for 1965; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to Senator MAGNUSON, Senator JACKSON, and to each member of the Washington delegation in the House of Representatives.

"Attest:

"WARD BOWDEN,

"Secretary of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"JOINT RESOLUTION PROPOSING ABOLITION OF FUTURES TRADING OF POTATOES ON THE NEW YORK MERCANTILE EXCHANGE BY THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in the 101st legislative session assem-

bled, most respectfully present and petition your honorable body as follows:

"Whereas the Constitution of the United States provides that the Congress may regulate commerce among the several States; and

"Whereas potatoes are now traded in futures contracts on the New York Mercantile Exchange, 6 Harrison Street, New York City, N.Y.; and

"Whereas the price at which future contracts are bought and sold has a direct and immediate effect on cash prices received by producers for potatoes in Maine and all other areas producing potatoes for market; and

"Whereas futures prices reflect the effects of manipulation and unlimited speculation to the detriment of producers of potatoes; and

"Whereas futures trading of potatoes obstructs all attempts of Maine potato producers to market their product in an orderly fashion; and

"Whereas futures trading of potatoes encourages overproduction in Maine and all other producing areas with resulting disastrously low prices for the producer; and

"Whereas experience has proven that futures trading can be carried on without detrimental and depressing effect on price only in the case of those commodities which can be stored for extensive periods of time either within the areas of production or the areas of marketing and distribution; and

"Whereas Irish potatoes are a perishable commodity that do not lend themselves to extended periods of storage, especially following preparation for market; and

"Whereas Irish potatoes historically are one of the most volatile commodities in terms of price range and in degree of sensitivity to myriad market factors, including total volume produced, anticipated production, available supply on track and in the marketplaces, as well as many others; and

"Whereas many areas of production have vehemently registered their opposition to the continued trading of Irish potato futures, either with or without the supervision of the Commodity Exchange Authority of the USDA, and producers in Maine, by mail ballot, have voted overwhelmingly in favor of abolishing futures trading in Maine potatoes; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has already established a precedent for the action to be proposed by this resolution in the instance of another perishable commodity, namely onions, leaving potatoes as the only perishable commodity now being traded on the futures market: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, your memorialists, recommend that the Congress enact legislation abolishing futures trading in Irish potatoes upon the New York Mercantile Exchange or upon any commodity exchange; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial, duly authenticated by the secretary of State, be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state, by mail, to the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress, to the Members of the said Senate and House of Representatives from this State.

"HARVEY R. PEASE,

"Clerk.

"CHESTER T. WINSLOW,

"Secretary."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Commerce:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 9

"Joint resolution relating to the creation of a Department of Fisheries and Oceanography

"Whereas the fisheries of the United States occupy an ever increasing importance to the general well-being of the Nation; and

"Whereas the power of States to adequately protect and enhance the value of fisheries is clearly limited by the nature of our constitutional system; and

"Whereas foreign nationals have created competitive pressures which may only be met on a national scale; and

"Whereas the past lack of interest of Federal authorities in fisheries problems has resulted in a drop of American fisheries production from second to fifth in the world market, and a complete lack of aid and protection for American fishermen; and

"Whereas fisheries provide a source of livelihood for hundreds of thousands of Americans citizens deserving of constant Federal attention to the maintenance and improvement of the industry; and

"Whereas a cabinet level Department of Fisheries and Oceanography containing a research and management section, an economic development section, and an international section is necessary to deal with the scope and magnitude of the problems involved; and

"Whereas Gov. William A. Egan has already requested the President of the United States to make every effort toward establishing such a cabinet position: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of Alaska joins with Governor Egan in respectfully urging the President of the United States to establish a Department of Fisheries and Oceanography at an early date; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States; the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives; and the members of the Alaska Delegation in Congress.

"Passed by the Senate February 5, 1963.

"FRANK PERATROVICH,

"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"EVELYN K. STEVENSON,

"Secretary of the Senate.

"Passed by the House, February 18, 1963.

"BRUCE KENDALL,

"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"PATRICIA R. SLACK,

"Chief Clerk of the House.

"[SEAL]

WILLIAM A. EGAN,

"Governor of Alaska."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Government Operations:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 39

"Whereas to resolve acute problems of civic administration, law enforcement and general health and welfare inflicted on large urban communities throughout the United States by a widespread and increasing influx of inhabitants from less densely populated regions of the Nation, the large urban communities have been compelled to accept and sustain severe financial burdens; and

"Whereas the difficulties inherent in such multitudinous residential changes from State to State are plainly national in area, scope and dimension; and

"Whereas the States and local governments obliged to provide for new residents are, apart from the failure of their resources, reluctant to expand the tax burden borne by their residents from a fear of assuming a position of economic disadvantage as compared with neighboring States; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has the power to check deteriorating welfare conditions of national scope by use of the resources of the Nation: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 73d General Assembly of the State of

Illinois, That the Congress of the United States be respectfully urged to adopt and enact appropriate measures to relieve the financial burdens presently borne by States and local governments as a result of numerous interstate residential changes; and that suitable copies of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and each Member of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives from Illinois.

"Adopted by the House, February 27, 1963.

"JOHN W. LEWIS, Jr.,

"Speaker, House of Representatives.

"FREDERIC B. SELIKE,

"Clerk, House of Representatives."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 8

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, assembled in the 37th session thereof, do respectfully represent that:

"Whereas in cooperation with the local interests, the Bureau of Reclamation has undertaken a study of the development of the Challis project in Custer County for the purpose of providing supplemental and additional irrigation of lands, the control of floods, the preservation of fish and wildlife, and the creation of additional recreational opportunities; and

"Whereas the proposed Challis project is an upstream storage project which will provide additional late-season water, will augment the existing livestock and grazing utilization of the area, and will stabilize and influence the general economic development and contribute to the further growth of the local area of the State and of the Nation; and

"Whereas the Challis project includes upstream storage development which will minimize or eliminate the existing possibilities of flood damages to the great benefit of the existing community and surrounding area; and

"Whereas, the Challis project investigational studies have indicated the proposed plan of development is economically and financially feasible and is desired by the local interests for the further development and economic growth of Custer County and of the State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Idaho, That the Congress and President of the United States be respectfully petitioned to give early consideration to the authorization and construction of the Challis project, Idaho; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, the Department of the Interior, the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the United States.

"Adopted by the senate on the 19th day of February 1963.

"W. E. DREVLON,

"President of the Senate.

"Adopted by the house of representatives on the 21st day of February 1963.

"PETE T. CENARRUSA,

"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Attest:

"ARTHUR WILSON,

"Secretary of the Senate."

The petition of A. W. Lafferty, of Washington, D.C., relating to the O and C Land Grant Acts of April 10 1869, and May 4, 1870; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RESOLUTION OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard is not only an integral part of New Hampshire's economy, but it is also closely linked with the history of shipbuilding in the United States.

That the Portsmouth Navy Yard be kept operating at full force is of utmost importance to the safety and security of this Nation. Since coming to Washington, I have been bending all efforts in this direction, and will continue to work for full employment at the Portsmouth Yard.

The honorable House of Representatives of the New Hampshire General Court has passed a resolution calling on the State's congressional delegation to "use their utmost endeavors to the end that the Portsmouth Navy Yard be kept in operation at full force, not only to supply our country with the needed submarines but to insure full-time employment for our citizens."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be entered in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

RESOLUTIONS IN RE PORTSMOUTH NAVY YARD

Whereas Portsmouth Navy Yard has been considered the top ranking navy yard since the days of wooden ships; and

Whereas it is of vast importance that this place be kept in operation particularly because it produces submarines which fire the Polaris missiles, an important part in our country's defense; and

Whereas many of its employees have been threatened with layoffs at the yard due to lack of work: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the General Court of New Hampshire

requests that our delegation in Washington, D.C., U.S. Senators NORRIS COTTON and THOMAS J. MCINTYRE and Congressmen JAMES C. CLEVELAND and LOUIS C. WYMAN, use their utmost endeavors to the end that the Portsmouth Navy Yard be kept in operation at full force, not only to supply our country with the needed submarines but to insure full-time employment for our citizens; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to each of the above-named members of our congressional delegation.

STEWART LAMPREY,

Speaker, House of Representatives.

JOHN D. HACKETT,

Representative from Epping.

FRANCIS W. TOLMAN,

Clerk, House of Representatives.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, without amendment:

S. 816. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Science and Technology (Rept. No. 16).

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT AND PAY

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal employment and pay for the month of January 1963. In accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, JANUARY 1963 AND DECEMBER 1962, AND PAY, DECEMBER AND NOVEMBER 1962

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

Information in monthly personnel reports for January 1963 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is summarized as follows:

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In January numbered—	In December numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (—)	In December was	In November was	Increase (+) or decrease (—)
Total ¹	2,477,937	2,486,628	—8,691	\$1,337,052	\$1,307,704	+\$29,258
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense.....	1,413,827	1,419,740	—5,913	789,232	735,455	+\$53,777
Department of Defense.....	1,064,110	1,066,888	—2,778	547,820	572,339	—\$24,519
Inside the United States.....	2,309,290	2,318,809	—9,519
Outside the United States.....	168,647	167,819	+828
Industrial employment.....	556,897	558,865	—1,968
Foreign nationals.....	168,766	169,666	—900	28,865	28,639	+\$226

¹ Exclusive of foreign national shown in the last line of this summary.

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agencies.

Table II breaks down the above employment figures to show the number inside the United States by agencies.

Table III breaks down the above employ-

ment figures to show the number outside the United States by agencies.

Table IV breaks down the above employment figures to show the number in industrial-type activities by agencies.

Table V shows foreign nationals by agencies not included in tables I, II, III, and IV.

TABLE I.—Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during January 1963, and comparison with December 1962, and pay for December 1962, and comparison with November 1962

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	January	December	Increase	Decrease	December	November	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture.....	101,017	104,624	3,607	\$49,809	\$51,038	\$1,229
Commerce.....	29,890	29,701	189	18,737	19,318	581
Health, Education, and Welfare.....	77,521	77,750	229	39,428	40,646	1,218
Interior.....	61,595	61,882	287	33,000	33,891	891
Justice.....	31,902	31,813	89	20,335	21,393	1,058
Labor.....	8,883	8,836	47	5,065	5,006	\$89
Post Office.....	583,991	588,829	4,838	\$350,066	279,129	70,937
State.....	41,214	41,101	113	20,565	21,468	903
Treasury.....	85,073	83,648	1,425	47,931	49,778	1,847
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office.....	351	338	13	236	238	2
Bureau of the Budget.....	468	466	2	402	417	15
Council of Economic Advisors.....	50	66	16	44	44
Executive Mansion and Grounds.....	73	79	6	41	46	5
National Aeronautics and Space Council.....	28	28	24	24
National Security Council.....	45	39	6	31	34	3
Office of Emergency Planning.....	434	416	18	350	371	21
Office of Science and Technology.....	45	63	18	27	30	3
President's Commission on Campaign Costs.....	(*)

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I.—Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during January 1963, and comparison with December 1962, and pay for December 1962, and comparison with November 1962—Continued

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	January	December	Increase	Decrease	December	November	Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies:								
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.....	27	43	-----	16	\$21	\$21	-----	-----
American Battle Monuments Commission.....	389	392	-----	3	81	80	\$1	-----
Atomic Energy Commission.....	6,992	6,953	39	-----	5,123	5,325	-----	\$202
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.....	607	602	5	-----	387	408	-----	21
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	832	830	2	-----	614	642	-----	28
Civil Service Commission.....	4,145	4,146	-----	1	2,752	2,451	301	-----
Civil War Centennial Commission.....	5	5	-----	-----	4	4	-----	-----
Commission on Fine Arts.....	7	7	-----	-----	6	6	-----	-----
Commission on Civil Rights.....	85	98	-----	13	52	59	-----	7
Delaware River Basin Commission.....	2	2	-----	-----	2	2	-----	-----
Export-Import Bank of Washington.....	281	277	4	-----	198	191	7	-----
Farm Credit Administration.....	240	240	-----	-----	170	179	-----	9
Federal Aviation Agency.....	45,256	45,273	-----	17	30,470	31,885	-----	1,415
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review.....	6	6	-----	-----	4	4	-----	-----
Federal Communications Commission.....	1,443	1,435	8	-----	973	1,014	-----	41
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.....	1,246	1,236	10	-----	786	832	-----	46
Federal Home Loan Bank Board.....	1,216	1,194	22	-----	764	814	-----	50
Federal Maritime Commission.....	211	198	13	-----	145	146	-----	1
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.....	391	390	1	-----	339	348	-----	9
Federal Power Commission.....	1,063	1,034	29	-----	724	731	-----	7
Federal Trade Commission.....	1,139	1,134	5	-----	772	807	-----	35
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.....	111	88	23	-----	58	55	3	-----
General Accounting Office.....	4,585	4,614	-----	29	2,927	3,070	-----	143
General Services Administration.....	31,959	32,004	-----	45	15,148	15,885	-----	737
Government Printing Office.....	7,135	7,084	51	-----	3,883	4,094	-----	211
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	13,704	13,626	78	-----	8,268	8,002	-----	334
Indian Claims Commission.....	22	22	-----	-----	26	21	5	-----
Interstate Commerce Commission.....	2,394	2,400	-----	6	1,602	1,680	-----	78
National Aeronautics and Space Administration.....	26,210	25,667	543	-----	18,421	19,881	-----	1,460
National Capital Housing Authority.....	414	418	-----	4	184	195	-----	11
National Capital Planning Commission.....	53	50	3	-----	33	36	-----	3
National Capital Transportation Agency.....	81	81	-----	-----	55	65	-----	10
National Gallery of Art.....	323	324	-----	1	136	145	-----	9
National Labor Relations Board.....	2,004	2,056	-----	52	1,359	1,410	-----	51
National Mediation Board.....	133	138	-----	5	116	128	-----	12
National Science Foundation.....	884	854	30	-----	673	620	53	-----
Panama Canal.....	15,634	14,905	729	-----	4,993	5,188	-----	195
President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity.....	43	47	-----	4	30	33	-----	3
Railroad Retirement Board.....	2,004	2,028	-----	24	1,117	1,143	-----	26
Renegotiation Board.....	207	206	1	-----	166	151	-----	15
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.....	158	155	3	-----	99	114	-----	15
Securities and Exchange Commission.....	1,409	1,405	4	-----	946	972	-----	26
Selective Service System.....	6,817	6,829	-----	12	2,132	2,219	-----	87
Small Business Administration.....	3,203	3,180	23	-----	1,971	2,075	-----	104
Smithsonian Institution.....	1,351	1,320	31	-----	668	699	-----	31
Soldiers' Home.....	1,056	1,059	-----	3	352	379	-----	27
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission.....	49	49	-----	-----	44	46	-----	2
Subversive Activities Control Board.....	26	26	-----	-----	21	22	-----	1
Tariff Commission.....	266	270	-----	4	196	203	-----	7
Tax Court of the United States.....	154	154	-----	-----	119	120	-----	1
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	17,608	18,025	-----	417	10,130	10,823	-----	693
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.....	113	106	7	-----	82	112	-----	30
U.S. Information Agency.....	11,517	11,444	73	-----	4,969	5,317	-----	348
Veterans' Administration.....	173,475	173,411	64	-----	77,682	80,968	-----	3,286
Virgin Islands Corporation.....	562	521	41	-----	118	134	-----	16
Total, excluding Department of Defense.....	1,413,827	1,419,740	3,744	9,657	789,232	735,455	71,396	17,619
Net change, excluding Department of Defense.....			5,913				53,777	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	2,075	2,055	20	-----	1,660	1,516	144	-----
Department of the Army.....	7,383,453	387,487	-----	4,034	190,704	200,017	-----	9,313
Department of the Navy.....	7,344,438	345,102	-----	664	183,686	191,851	-----	8,165
Department of the Air Force.....	306,347	306,886	-----	539	159,139	165,960	-----	6,821
Defense Atomic Support Agency.....	2,017	2,074	-----	57	1,011	1,065	-----	54
Defense Communications Agency.....	478	290	188	-----	165	178	-----	13
Defense Intelligence Agency.....	306	285	21	-----	191	201	-----	10
Defense Supply Agency.....	23,427	21,149	2,278	-----	10,094	10,350	-----	256
Office of Civil Defense.....	1,032	1,026	6	-----	867	864	3	-----
U.S. Court of Military Appeals.....	40	40	-----	-----	31	34	-----	3
Interdepartmental activities.....	20	18	2	-----	17	15	2	-----
International military activities.....	58	57	1	-----	39	38	1	-----
Armed Forces information and education activities.....	419	419	-----	-----	216	220	-----	4
Total, Department of Defense.....	1,064,110	1,066,888	2,516	5,294	547,820	572,331	150	24,669
Net decrease, Department of Defense.....			2,778				24,519	
Grand total, including Department of Defense *.....	2,477,937	2,486,628	6,260	14,951	1,337,052	1,307,794	71,546	42,288
Net change, including Department of Defense.....			8,691				29,258	

* Revised on basis of later information.

* Includes pay of temporary Christmas employees.

* January figure includes 16,401 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 16,460 in December and their pay. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The January figure includes 4,179 of these trust fund employees and the December figure includes 4,205.

* January figure includes 860 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 832 in December and their pay.

* Less than \$500.

* Subject to revision.

* In January 2,044 employees and their functions were transferred to the Defense Supply Agency as follows: 1,899 from the Department of the Army and 145 from the Department of the Navy.

* Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency.

* Includes employment by Federal agencies under the Public Works Acceleration Act (Public Law 87-658), as follows:

Agency	January	December	Change
Agriculture Department.....	4,897	7,854	-2,957
Interior Department.....	3,259	3,395	-136
Department of the Army.....	495	434	+61
Total.....	8,651	11,683	-3,032

TABLE II.—Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during January 1963, and comparison with December 1962

Department or agency	January	December	Increase	Decrease	Department or agency	January	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):					Independent agencies—Continued				
Agriculture.....	99,819	103,472		3,653	National Capital Transportation Agency.....	81	81		
Commerce.....	29,254	29,067	187		National Gallery of Art.....	323	324		1
Health, Education, and Welfare.....	76,909	77,164		255	National Labor Relations Board.....	1,970	2,022		52
Interior.....	61,080	61,363		283	National Mediation Board.....	133	138		5
Justice.....	31,553	31,471	82		National Science Foundation.....	871	841	30	
Labor.....	8,786	8,751	35		Panama Canal.....	153	80	73	
Post Office.....	582,539	587,369		4,830	President's Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity.....	43	47		4
State ¹	10,393	10,277	116		Railroad Retirement Board.....	2,004	2,028		24
Treasury.....	84,459	83,030	1,429		Renegotiation Board.....	207	206	1	
Executive Office of the President:					St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.....	158	155	3	
White House Office.....	351	338	13		Securities and Exchange Commission.....	1,409	1,405	4	
Bureau of the Budget.....	468	466	2		Selective Service System.....	6,665	6,677		12
Council of Economic Advisers.....	50	66		16	Small Business Administration.....	3,151	3,128	23	
Executive Mansion and Grounds.....	73	79		6	Smithsonian Institution.....	1,339	1,306	33	
National Aeronautics and Space Council.....	28	28			Soldiers' Home.....	1,056	1,059		3
National Security Council.....	45	39	6		South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission.....	49	49		
Office of Emergency Planning.....	434	416	18		Subversive Activities Control Board.....	26	26		
Office of Science and Technology.....	45	63		18	Tariff Commission.....	266	270		4
Independent agencies:					Tax Court of the United States.....	154	154		
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.....	27	43		16	Tennessee Valley Authority.....	17,606	18,023		417
American Battle Monuments Commission.....	7	7			U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.....	113	106	7	
Atomic Energy Commission.....	6,959	6,922	37		U.S. Information Agency.....	3,215	3,177	38	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.....	607	602	5		Veterans' Administration.....	172,462	172,406	56	
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	831	829	2						
Civil Service Commission.....	4,141	4,142		1	Total, excluding Department of Defense.	1,350,140	1,356,894	2,966	9,720
Civil War Centennial Commission.....	5	5			Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense.			6,754	
Commission of Fine Arts.....	7	7							
Commission on Civil Rights.....	85	98		13	Department of Defense:				
Delaware River Basin Commission.....	2	2			Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	2,014	1,994	20	
Export-Import Bank of Washington.....	281	277	4		Department of the Army.....	331,293	335,256		3,963
Farm Credit Administration.....	240	240			Department of the Navy.....	320,086	320,903		817
Federal Aviation Agency.....	44,248	44,269		21	Department of the Air Force.....	278,007	278,448		441
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review.....	6	6			Defense Atomic Support Agency.....	2,017	2,074		57
Federal Communications Commission.....	1,441	1,433	8		Defense Communications Agency.....	452	267	185	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.....	1,244	1,234	10		Defense Intelligence Agency.....	306	285	21	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board.....	1,216	1,194	22		Defense Supply Agency.....	23,427	21,149	2,278	
Federal Maritime Commission.....	211	198	13		Office of Civil Defense.....	1,032	1,026	6	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.....	391	390	1		U.S. Court of Military Appeals.....	40	40		
Federal Power Commission.....	1,063	1,034	29		Interdepartmental activities.....	19	17	2	
Federal Trade Commission.....	1,139	1,134	5		International military activities.....	38	37	1	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.....	66	64	2		Armed Forces information and education activities.....	419	419		
General Accounting Office.....	4,498	4,529		31					
General Services Administration.....	31,947	31,992		45	Total, Department of Defense.	959,150	961,915	2,513	5,278
Government Printing Office.....	7,135	7,084	51		Net decrease, Department of Defense.			2,765	
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	13,522	13,448	74						
Indian Claims Commission.....	22	22			Grand total, including Department of Defense.	2,309,290	2,318,809	5,479	14,998
Interstate Commerce Commission.....	2,394	2,400		6	Net decrease, including Department of Defense.			9,519	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration.....	26,198	25,654	544						
National Capital Housing Authority.....	414	418		4					
National Capital Planning Commission.....	53	50	3						

¹ January figure includes 2,720 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 2,732 in December.

² January figure includes 588 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 575 in December.

³ Revised on basis of later information.

⁴ Subject to revision.

⁵ In January 2,044 employees and their functions were transferred to the Defense Supply Agency as follows: 1,899 from the Department of the Army and 145 from the Department of the Navy.

TABLE III.—Federal personnel outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during January 1963, and comparison with December 1962

Department or agency	January	December	Increase	Decrease	Department or agency	January	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):					Independent agencies—Continued				
Agriculture.....	1,198	1,152	46		Selective Service System.....	152	152		
Commerce.....	636	634	2		Small Business Administration.....	52	52		
Health, Education, and Welfare.....	612	586	26		Smithsonian Institution.....	12	14		2
Interior.....	515	519		4	Tennessee Valley Authority.....	2	2		
Justice.....	349	342	7		U.S. Information Agency.....	8,302	8,267	35	
Labor.....	97	85	12		Veterans' Administration.....	1,013	1,005	8	
Post Office.....	1,452	1,460		8	Virgin Islands Corporation.....	652	521	131	
State ¹	30,821	30,524	297						
Treasury.....	614	618		4	Total, excluding Department of Defense.	63,687	62,846	841	25
Independent agencies:					Net increase, excluding Department of Defense.			841	
American Battle Monuments Commission.....	382	385		3					
Atomic Energy Commission.....	33	31	2		Department of Defense:				
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	1	1			Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	61	61		
Civil Service Commission.....	4	4			Department of the Army.....	52,160	52,231		71
Federal Aviation Agency.....	1,008	1,004	4		Department of the Navy.....	24,352	24,199	153	
Federal Communications Commission.....	2	2			Department of the Air Force.....	28,340	28,438		98
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.....	2	2			Defense Communications Agency.....	26	23	3	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.....	45	24	21		Interdepartmental activities.....	1	1		
General Accounting Office.....	87	85	2		International military activities.....	20	20		
General Services Administration.....	12	12							
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	182	178	4		Total, Department of Defense.	104,960	104,973	156	169
National Aeronautics and Space Administration.....	12	13		1	Net decrease, Department of Defense.			13	
National Labor Relations Board.....	34	34							
National Science Foundation.....	13	13			Grand total, including Department of Defense.	168,647	167,819	1,022	194
Panama Canal.....	15,481	14,825	656		Net increase, including Department of Defense.			828	

¹ January figure includes 13,681 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 13,728 in December. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The January figure includes 4,179 of these trust fund employees and the December figure includes 4,205.

² January figure includes 272 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 257 in December.

TABLE IV.—Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during January 1963, and comparison with December 1962

Department or agency	January	December	Increase	Decrease	Department or agency	January	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):					Department of Defense:				
Agriculture.....	3,779	3,794	15		Department of the Army:				
Commerce.....	5,404	5,581	177		Inside the United States.....	131,860	133,381	1,521	
Interior.....	8,490	8,475	15		Outside the United States.....	14,275	14,298	23	
Post Office.....	252	248	4		Department of the Navy:				
Treasury.....	5,184	5,134	50		Inside the United States.....	197,509	198,082	573	
Independent agencies:					Outside the United States.....	1,279	1,279		
Atomic Energy Commission.....	250	247	3		Department of the Air Force:				
Federal Aviation Agency.....	2,938	2,960	22		Inside the United States.....	134,064	134,540	476	
General Services Administration.....	1,766	1,780	14		Outside the United States.....	1,196	1,200	4	
Government Printing Office.....	7,135	7,084	51		Defense Supply Agency:				
National Aeronautics and Space Administration.....	26,210	25,667	543		Inside the United States.....	1,963	1,980	17	
Panama Canal.....	8,074	7,482	592		Total, Department of Defense.....	472,146	474,760	2,614	
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.....	156	155	1		Net decrease, Department of Defense.....			2,614	
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	14,551	14,977	426						
Virgin Islands Corporation.....	562	521	41		Grand total, including Department of Defense.....	556,897	558,865	1,968	3,268
Total, excluding Department of Defense.....	84,751	84,105	1,300	654	Net decrease, including Department of Defense.....			1,968	
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense.....			646						

¹ Subject to revision.² Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—Foreign nationals working under U.S. agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of January 1963 and comparison with December 1962

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force	
	January	December	January	December	January	December	January	December
Canada.....	35	35					35	35
Crete.....	61	62					61	62
England.....	3,324	3,315			102	102	3,222	3,215
France.....	22,007	22,268	18,090	18,344	11	11	3,906	3,913
Germany.....	81,762	81,457	68,992	68,698	85	85	12,685	12,674
Greece.....	266	267					266	267
Greenland.....	174	174					174	174
Japan.....	51,979	52,878	18,553	18,521	14,225	14,366	19,201	19,391
Korea.....	6,207	6,204	6,207	6,204				
Morocco.....	2,357	2,410			786	785	1,571	1,625
Netherlands.....	54	55					54	55
Trinidad.....	540	541			540	541		
Total.....	168,766	169,666	111,842	112,167	15,749	15,888	41,175	41,611

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported civilian employment in the month of January totaling 2,477,937 as compared with 2,486,628 in December. This was a net decrease of 8,691 including a net reduction of 3,032 in temporary employment under the Public Works Acceleration Program authorized by P.L. 87-658.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1963, which began July 1, 1962, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
July 1962.....	2,510,950	14,455	
August.....	2,512,199	1,249	
September.....	2,485,324		26,875
October.....	2,482,982		2,342
November.....	2,498,312	15,330	
December.....	2,486,628		11,684
January 1963.....	2,477,937		8,691

Total Federal employment in civilian agencies for the month of January was 1,413,827, a decrease of 5,913 as compared with the December total of 1,419,740. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in January was 1,064,110, a decrease of 2,778 as compared with 1,066,888 in December.

Civilian agencies reporting larger decreases were Post Office Department with 4,838 and

Agriculture Department with 3,607. Larger increases were reported by Treasury Department with 1,425, Panama Canal Company with 729, and National Aeronautics and Space Administration with 543. The decrease in Agriculture Department and increase in Treasury Department was largely seasonal.

In the Department of Defense decreases in civilian employment were reported by the Department of the Army with 4,034, Department of the Navy with 664, and the Department of the Air Force with 539. The largest increase was reported by the Defense Supply Agency with 2,278.

Inside the United States civilian employment decreased 9,519 and outside the United States civilian employment increased 828. Industrial employment by Federal agencies in January totaled 556,897, a decrease of 1,968.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,477,937 civilian employees certified to the committee by Federal agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in U.S. Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 168,766 foreign nationals working for U.S. agencies

overseas during January who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in December was 169,666. A breakdown of this employment for January follows:

Foreign nationals, January 1963

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
Canada.....	35			35
Crete.....	61			61
England.....	3,324		102	3,222
France.....	22,007	18,090	11	3,906
Germany.....	81,762	68,992	85	12,685
Greece.....	266			266
Greenland.....	174			174
Japan.....	51,979	18,553	14,225	19,201
Korea.....	6,207	6,207		
Morocco.....	2,357		786	1,571
Netherlands.....	54			54
Trinidad.....	540		540	
Total.....	168,766	111,842	15,749	41,175

FEDERAL PAYROLL

(There is a lag of a month between Federal employment and Federal payroll figures in order that actual expenditures may be reported. Payroll expenditure figures in the committee report this month are for December.)

Payroll expenditure figures in the executive branch during the first 6 months of the current fiscal year 1963 total \$7.6 billion. These payroll expenditures for the first half

of the fiscal year, July-December 1962, exclusive of \$168 million of U.S. pay for foreign nationals not on the regular rolls, follow:

Month:	Payroll (in millions)
July.....	\$1,222
August.....	1,282
September.....	1,147
October.....	1,317
November.....	1,308
December.....	1,337
Total.....	7,613

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McGEE (for himself and Mr. SIMPSON):

S. 982. A bill permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division, Riverton Reclamation Project, Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. McGEE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 983. A bill to amend chapter 93 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the use of contracting authority by officers and employees of the United States for purposes of duress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. LAUSCHE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER:

S. 984. A bill for the relief of Ling-Chuan Chiao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 985. A bill for the relief of the Boren Clay Products Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEARSON (for himself and Mr. CARLSON):

S. 986. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Prairie National Park, in the State of Kansas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. PEARSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. KEATING):

S. 987. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain additional losses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 988. A bill to amend title I of the Social Security Act so as to define more specifically certain of the benefits which may be provided under State programs of medical assistance for the aged established pursuant to such title; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 989. A bill to require the national referendum on wheat to be held prior to May 15, 1963; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 990. A bill to give financial assistance to the States for educational purposes by authorizing annual appropriations to each State equal to 1 percent of the Federal individual incomes taxes collected therein; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. COTTON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S. 991. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States; and for other purposes; and

S. 992. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to provide additional choice of health benefits plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself and Mr. MOSS):

S. 993. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to make findings with respect to the amount of compensation to which certain individuals are entitled as reimbursement for damages sustained by them as a result of the cancellation of their grazing permits by the U.S. Air Force, and to provide for payments of amounts so determined to such individuals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 994. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, as amended;

S. 995. A bill to amend the Street Readjustment Act of the District of Columbia so as to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to close all or part of a street, road, highway, or alley in accordance with the requirements of an approved redevelopment or urban renewal plan, without regard to the notice provisions of such act, and for other purposes;

S. 996. A bill to increase the partial pay of educational employees of the public schools of the District of Columbia who are on leave of absence for educational improvement, and for other purposes;

S. 997. A bill to promote safe driving and eliminate the reckless and irresponsible driver from the streets and highways of the District of Columbia by providing that any person operating a motor vehicle within the District while apparently under the influence of intoxicating liquor shall be deemed to have given his consent to a chemical test of certain of his body substances to determine the alcoholic content of his blood, and for other purposes;

S. 998. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for a mutual-aid plan for fire protection by and for the District of Columbia and certain adjacent communities in Maryland and Virginia, and for other purposes";

S. 999. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 4, 1925;

S. 1000. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell a right-of-way across a portion of the District Training School grounds at Laurel, Md., and for other purposes;

S. 1001. A bill to provide for the regulation of the business of selling securities in the District of Columbia and for the licensing of persons engaged therein, and for other purposes; and

S. 1002. A bill to authorize certain expenses in the Government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CASE:

S. 1003. A bill for the relief of the Middlesex Concrete Products and Excavating Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1004. A bill to authorize appointment of the Director and Deputy Director of the

Coast and Geodetic Survey from civilian life, and for other purposes; and

S. 1005. A bill to amend paragraph (2) (G) of subsection 309(c) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by granting the Federal Communications Commission additional authority to grant special temporary authorizations for 60 days for certain nonbroadcast operations; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 1006. A bill to amend the act of June 12, 1960, for the correction of inequities in the construction of fishing vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MORSE, and Mrs. NEUBERGER):

S. 1007. A bill to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself and Mr. CLARK):

S. 1008. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the delivery of Lincoln's immortal address at Gettysburg; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

S. 1009. A bill to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mrs. NEUBERGER when she introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 1010. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits under such title; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

PRINTING AS A HOUSE DOCUMENT
THE PAMPHLET ENTITLED "OUR
AMERICAN GOVERNMENT—1,001
QUESTIONS ON HOW IT WORKS"

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 26) to authorize the printing as a House document the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government—1,001 Questions on How It Works," which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. HUMPHREY, which appears under a separate heading.)

RIGHT OF PERSONS RESIDING ON FEDERALLY OWNED LANDS TO VOTE IN CERTAIN ELECTIONS

Mr. BEALL submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 27); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is hereby declared to be the sense of the Congress that

persons residing on federally owned lands (other than military reservations) situated in any State should be extended the right to vote in elections conducted in such State for presidential and vice presidential electors and for Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States if such persons meet all the requirements for voting in such State except the requirement of residence, which requirement they are unable to meet solely because they reside on federally owned lands.

RESOLUTIONS

TO PRINT AS A DOCUMENT A COMPILATION OF MATERIALS ENTITLED "SUMMER EMPLOYMENT BY COLLEGE STUDENTS IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—1961"

Mr. SALTONSTALL submitted a resolution (S. Res. 105) to print as a document a compilation of materials entitled "Summer Employment by College Students in the Federal Government—1961," which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. SALTONSTALL, which appears under a separate heading.)

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE DOCUMENT 117, 84TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

Mr. EASTLAND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 106); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed seven thousand additional copies of Senate Document Numbered 117, of the Eighty-fourth Congress, second session, entitled "The Communist Party of the United States of America, What It Is, How It Works—A Handbook for Americans", compiled by the Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate.

DELIVERY OF WATER TO LANDS IN THIRD DIVISION, RIVERTON RECLAMATION PROJECT, WYOMING

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to permit the delivery of water by the Bureau of Reclamation to settlers in the third division on the Riverton reclamation project in Wyoming.

This project was initiated following World War II. It has promise of being a very beneficial and useful project, Mr. President, but unfortunately problems have been encountered that have delayed the execution of repayment contracts past the development period. My bill would give authority for water delivery in the division to farmers who want it. Without this authority no water can be released this year. I need not stress the need for a rapid decision on this matter. Mother Nature waits for no man, and today's wonderful weather is an indication that spring is almost

here. The farmers in the third division have plans to make and those plans will hinge upon the availability of water from this project for this year's growing season.

Mr. President, I will not go into the problems that have beset this project except to say that they are problems which can be corrected. My bill would allow for water now while permanent solutions to these problems are being worked out. I might point out that at the direction of the Congress a Wyoming reclamation projects survey team was appointed by the Bureau of Reclamation to study this project and others in my State. This team, made up of highly qualified men, has just completed its study of the Riverton project and submitted a report and recommendations to the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. President, I am confident that with the assistance of this valuable report and with the cooperation of the settlers, Bureau of Reclamation, affected State agencies and the Congress of the United States, we will be able to find permanent solutions to the problems of the third division. In the meantime, I would urge rapid consideration of the bill I introduce today so that the farmers on this project may start preparations for planting their crops.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 982) permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division, Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming, introduced by Mr. McGEE (for himself and Mr. SIMPSON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROHIBITION OF USE OF CONTRACTING AUTHORITY BY OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES FOR PURPOSES OF DURESS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend chapter 93 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the use of contracting authority by officers and employees of the United States for purposes of duress.

Mr. President, the time has arrived when the Congress of the United States must define by law the power that may be used by Federal agencies and officials in coercing private industry and labor to adopt business practices, including labor-management relations, to suit the feelings of Federal officials.

Without special authority granted by the Congress, no Federal official or agency should be permitted to withhold or threaten to withhold any contract from the operator of a business on the grounds that such operator did not adopt labor-management practices responding to the individual will and wish of such Federal official. Manifestly a private enterprise which seeks a Government contract ought to be awarded such contract if it is the lowest responsible bidder and has fully complied with the requirements of law as distinguished from

the requirements of the Federal official's individual fancies and feelings.

In the labor-management disputes involving the steel industry, General Dynamics Corp., North American Aviation, Inc., Ryan Aeronautical Co., Lockheed Aircraft Corp., and currently the Boeing Aircraft Corp., Federal officials threatened to withhold contracts from these employers unless, in the management of their respective business, they followed practices demanded by the Federal officials although such practices were not required by law.

These threats should not have been made. They had no authority in law. They constituted an usurpation of power; a vivid example of government by men and not by law. Newspapers and news magazines from coast to coast have carried numerous articles citing alleged threats and acts of coercion against firms holding important Government contracts.

Mr. President, I am certain that if the Congress were called upon to pass a law authorizing a governmental agency or official to order a settlement of a labor-management dispute in conformity with the views of the Federal agency or officer, such proposal would meet with vigorous opposition from both labor and management. The opposition would argue that labor as well as management should not be harnessed and strait-jacketed in managing their own business.

Ours is a government of laws and not of men.

To me that precept means something. I only regret that it is not inscribed somewhere on the wall of the Senate Chamber. Let us quit invoking our whims and fancies, disregarding the requirements of law in the execution of our duties.

Motivated by their own wishes, Federal officials should not be allowed to force their judgments of what is right or wrong upon either business or labor management. When we permit that type of conduct we enter the dangerous field of requiring the people not to act in conformity with established law but in obedience to the changing wishes of changing men in changing administrations. It is wrong, should not be suffered, and is a threat to our democratic system of government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 983) to amend chapter 93 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the use of contracting authority by officers and employees of the United States for purposes of duress, introduced by Mr. LAUSCHE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 93 of title 18, United States Code (relating to Public Officers and Employees),

is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 1916. Duress through use of contracting authority

"(a) Whoever, being an officer or employee of the United States or any department or agency thereof—

"(1) with intent to coerce or induce any person to perform any act which such person has no obligation to perform, or to refrain from performing any act which such person may refrain from performing without default of any obligation; or

"(2) with intent to penalize any person for the performance of any act which such person was entitled to perform without default of any obligation, or for refusing to perform or for refraining from performing any act which such person had no obligation to perform,

withholds, attempts to withhold, or threatens to withhold from such person by any means any Government contract, or excludes, attempts to exclude, or threatens to exclude such person by any means from opportunity to enter into or to perform any Government contract, shall be fined not more than \$10,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"(b) As used in this section—

"(1) the term 'obligation', when used in relation to any person, means an obligation imposed upon such person by any statute of the United States, any rule or regulation duly prescribed or promulgated pursuant to any such statute, or any Government contract to which such person is a party or under which such person has assumed duties; and

"(2) the term 'Government contract' means any actual, proposed, or prospective contract entered into or which may be entered into by or on behalf of the United States or any department or agency thereof, and any actual, proposed, or prospective assignment, substitution of parties, or subcontract of any tier entered into or which may be entered into for or in connection with the performance of any such contract."

(b) The sectional analysis of that chapter is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"1916. Duress through use of contracting authority,"

PRAIRIE NATIONAL PARK IN POTTAWATOMIE COUNTY, KANS.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing the establishment of a Prairie National Park in Pottawatomie County, Kans.

Expanding our National Park Service to include more features mirroring this country's natural offerings and its latent beauty was a basic part of a national policy concerning recreational resources.

As a Senator from Kansas, I am conscious that in the vast expanse of land in the heartland of this Nation, there are acres of natural prairie which, today, face extinction unless they are preserved.

I am in agreement with the program of the National Park Service, as previously stated, that we must do our utmost to preserve such latent natural areas as the midwestern prairie. We ask that the establishment of a Prairie National Park in Pottawatomie County be one of the priority projects of the Department of the Interior and the National Park Service. The establishment

of a Prairie National Park will complement the national recreational development.

After full evaluation by a team from the National Park Service, it was found that Pottawatomie County offered not only the finest examples of true prairie, but also ideal wildlife habitat which would be conducive to the establishment of herds of buffalo, antelope, and deer, as well as providing propagation grounds for game birds such as the prairie chicken and quail.

Specifically, the park would be located in an area not to exceed 60,000 acres along the eastern shore of Tuttle Creek Reservoir.

The Prairie National Park bill has been drafted to provide the maximum in community and local participation to assure landowners in the affected area of full opportunity to help decide the boundaries within which the park would be established.

The bill provides for a seven member advisory commission which would give Pottawatomie County and the State of Kansas a voice in the deliberations and recommendations. Under the terms of the bill, the advisory commission would recommend to the Secretary of Interior where the park's boundaries would be established. This arrangement has met with the approval of the local people, the National Park Service, and the Department of the Interior.

I am advised meetings have been held with representatives of the affected landowners and it was determined that owners should be accommodated by early condemnation of their properties if negotiations for sale were not successful. This would prevent the landowner from being subjected to lingering and fruitless negotiations. Provision for this has been included in the bill.

Since the establishment of the Prairie National Park has been approved by the National Park Service, congressional endorsement would add another chapter to our park, monument, and historic site program and would fill a void in this system of natural showplaces by adding to our recreational system in the Nation and in Kansas.

I might point out, in closing, Mr. President, that Kansas is proud to have been selected as the site for a possible national park following a long and intensive study of numerous sites. We are indeed happy with the prospect of having the Prairie National Park as the first such national park, monument, or historic site in Kansas.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this bill providing for the establishment of a Prairie National Park in Pottawatomie County, Kans., be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 986) to authorize the establishment of the Prairie National Park, in the State of Kansas, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PEARSON (for himself and Mr. CARLSON), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and In-

sular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in recognition of the influence of grasslands upon the progress and economic development of our country, and to preserve the scenic, scientific, and educational values of a representative portion of such lands for the inspiration and enjoyment of this and future generations, there is hereby authorized to be established, in the manner hereinafter provided, the Prairie National Park, in the State of Kansas, such park to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented.

Sec. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to designate such land and interests in land in townships 7, 8, and 9 south, range 7 east; townships 7, 8, and 9 south, range 8 east; and townships 8 and 9 south, range 9 east; sixth principal meridian, as he determines are necessary and desirable to preserve representative portions of the prairie grasslands and the native wildlife: *Provided,* That the area as designated shall not exceed sixty thousand acres.

(b) For the purpose of assisting the Secretary to designate a suitable boundary line for the Prairie National Park, there is hereby established an advisory commission to be composed of seven members as follows:

(1) the Chairman of the National Parks Advisory Board, who shall serve as chairman of the advisory commission;

(2) two members selected by the Secretary from among individuals recommended by the Board of County Commissioners of Pottawatomie County, Kans.;

(3) two members selected by the Secretary from among individuals recommended by the Governor of the State of Kansas; and

(4) two members selected by the Secretary.

Sec. 3. Within the area designated as the Prairie National Park pursuant to section 2 hereof, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to procure land and interests in land through purchase, exchange, donation or with donated funds.

When requested by the owner of property with respect to which the Secretary of the Interior has been unable to negotiate a voluntary sale, the Secretary, subject to the availability of funds, shall initiate action to file a declaration of taking on such property in accordance with section 258A of title 40, United States Code.

Administrative jurisdiction over the lands administered by the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, above contour elevation 1,075 and which, under the authority of section 2 of this Act, are designated for inclusion in the park, is hereby transferred to the Secretary of the Interior without a transfer of funds. Such transfer of administrative jurisdiction shall not preclude continuation of flowage uses of the affected lands by the corps but shall preclude the development by the corps of access roads and such other development as would, in the judgment of the Secretary, defeat or impair the purposes of the park.

Sec. 4. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with the State of Kansas, and its political subdivisions, including Pottawatomie County, which will enhance or insure preservation of the park and promote use thereof in accordance with the purposes of this Act.

Sec. 5. When the Secretary of the Interior has designated a boundary for the Prairie National Park pursuant to section 2 of this Act and has determined that sufficient land and interests in land have been procured by the United States to provide an admin-

istrable unit within such boundary, he shall declare the establishment of the Prairie National Park by publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register. Following such establishment, and subject to the aforesaid acreage limitation, the Secretary may continue to acquire lands and interests in land for the park as authorized in this Act.

Sec. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

UNFINISHED WAR-CLAIMS LEGISLATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, during the 87th Congress, a measure—Public Law 87-846—was enacted which resolved part of the long-outstanding problem of war claims settlement. In that legislation, Congress dealt among other things with the sale of seized properties, such as the General Aniline & Film Corp., which, as we note from today's newspaper accounts, will also happily be the subject of settlement in the courts as well. This is good news for a number of communities around the Nation, but particularly in Binghamton, N.Y., where a large Anso plant is located.

However, I rise today to emphasize that, despite these long-awaited developments, a significant problem in the war claims area remains unresolved. I refer to two classes of claimants who as yet have received no measure of recognition for their claims: The first consists of refugees from Nazism and other tyrannies who became citizens of the United States after their property was seized. I offered an amendment to last year's bill to include such claimants, but the conferees rejected the amendment, at the same time offering hope that if funds remain after payment of other claimants, favorable action might ultimately be taken for these unfortunate citizens.

My colleague, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], also introduced an amendment to deal with a second group of claimants: prisoners of war and internees who have personal injury claims. When this amendment was also rejected, Senator DOUGLAS and I introduced S. 3796 to incorporate both provisions and pledged our continued efforts to have these measures enacted.

I am now sending to the desk on behalf of my colleagues, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], and myself a measure identical to S. 3796. I hope that action will not be delayed on this still unfinished war-claims legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 987) to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain additional losses, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. KEATING), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill designed to cor-

rect a deficiency in an earlier social security bill which I introduced in the present session of Congress. Briefly, the bill would expand the term of "prescription services" to include drugs prescribed by a dentist and such other persons authorized to prescribe drugs in addition to the physicians provided in the earlier bill. I send the bill to the desk and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 988) to amend title I of the Social Security Act so as to define more specifically certain of the benefits which may be provided under State programs of medical assistance for the aged established pursuant to such title, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate referral, a bill which, upon enactment, will give financial assistance to the States and the District of Columbia for educational purposes by authorizing annual appropriations to each State and the District of Columbia equal to 1 percent of the Federal individual income taxes collected therein.

I feel strongly that this bill represents a direct and workable solution to a serious problem of national concern and I expect to address the Senate more fully on the advantages of the bill at a later date.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 990) to give financial assistance to the States for educational purposes by authorizing annual appropriations to each State equal to 1 percent of the Federal individual income taxes collected therein, introduced by Mr. COTTON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

APPOINTMENT OF DIRECTOR AND DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY FROM CIVILIAN LIFE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request of the Acting Secretary of Commerce, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize appointment of the Director and Deputy Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey from civilian life. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Acting Secretary, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1004) to authorize appointment of the Director and Deputy Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey from civilian life, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by

its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,

Washington, D.C., February 25, 1963.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are enclosed four copies of a draft bill "To authorize appointment of the Director and Deputy Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey from civilian life, and for other purposes" and four copies of a statement of purpose and need in support thereof.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there would be no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

C. D. MARTIN, Jr.,

Acting Secretary of Commerce.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED

The purpose of this legislation is to authorize the appointment of the Director and Deputy Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey from civilian life.

Under existing law the Director and Deputy Director are required to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for terms of 4 years, from the active list of commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey not below the rank of commander. (Section 1, act of June 4, 1920, 41 Stat. 825, as amended (33 U.S.C. 852), and section 8, act of January 19, 1942, 56 Stat. 8, as amended (33 U.S.C. 852b).)

In 1960 a Special Advisory Committee of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, chaired by Dr. Mervin J. Kelly, submitted to the Secretary of Commerce a comprehensive report entitled "The Role of the Department of Commerce in Science and Technology."

The Committee made two recommendations concerning the Survey which required legislative action. The first of these recommendations was that the act of August 6, 1947, 61 Stat. 787 (33 U.S.C. 883a, Public Law 373, 80th Congress), be amended to remove the geographical restrictions imposed on operations of the Survey. The act of April 5, 1960, 74 Stat. 16 (Public Law 86-409), enacted this recommendation into law.

The second recommendation was that "the positions of Director and Deputy Director be open to both civilians and officers, with the only restriction being that both positions not be filled simultaneously by either officers or civilians."

The proposed legislation would implement this recommendation of the Committee. In addition to opening these positions up to civilians as well as to commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the bill would provide that the Director shall serve at the pleasure of the President, rather than for a term of 4 years. This change is in conformity with existing practice in the appointment of the heads of other important bureaus in the Department of Commerce, including the National Bureau of Standards, the Weather Bureau, the Patent Office, the Bureau of the Census, the Maritime Administration, the Bureau of Public Roads, the Area Redevelopment Administration, and the U.S. Travel Service.

The bill would further provide that the Deputy Director shall be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce and shall serve at his pleasure, rather than be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. This change is in accord with common practice in filling positions at the deputy chief level in civilian

Government bureaus. In addition, it represents a return to the practice long followed prior to 1942. (See act of June 5, 1920, 41 Stat. 929.)

The proposed legislation would provide increased flexibility in appointment of the two top officials of the Coast and Geodetic Survey. It would greatly broaden the sources from which selections may be made for the two most important positions in the bureau. It would provide a better balance in the background, skills, and orientation of the officials responsible for directing the work of the bureau by providing for a team of commissioned officer and civilian scientific and engineering personnel. Finally, it would tend to strengthen the capacity of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to recruit and retain outstanding civilian professional and technical personnel for its important programs in oceanography, aeronautical charting, geodetic and geophysical survey work, and research in related fields, by providing improved career opportunities for civilians in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Appropriate provision has been made for the compensation of the Director and Deputy Director, when appointed from civilian life.

The recommendation of the Kelly Committee that both positions should not be filled simultaneously by either officers or civilians is provided in the form of a directive to the Secretary of Commerce to follow such a policy to the extent he deems appropriate. It is believed unwise arbitrarily to specify such a requirement since flexibility should be reserved under which the Secretary may make whatever selection may appear to be in the best interests of the Department under various circumstances, e.g., a period of national emergency, non-availability of a well-qualified commissioned officer, nonavailability of a well-qualified individual from civilian life, and the like.

Various other minor changes of a technical or editorial nature are included in the bill.

Provision is made in the bill that it shall not be deemed to require reappointment or other change in the employment status of any person serving as Director or Deputy Director under an appointment made prior to the date of enactment of the bill.

AUTHORITY TO GRANT SPECIAL TEMPORARY AUTHORIZATIONS FOR 60 DAYS FOR CERTAIN NON-BROADCAST OPERATIONS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request of the Federal Communications Commission, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend paragraph (2) (G) of subsection 309(c) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by granting the Federal Communications Commission additional authority to grant special temporary authorizations for 60 days for certain nonbroadcast operations. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Acting Chairman of the Commission requesting the proposed legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1005) to amend section 309(c) (2) (G) of the Communications Act of 1934 to permit the Federal Communications Commission to grant special temporary authorizations for periods of 60 days in certain cases, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., February 20, 1963.

THE VICE PRESIDENT,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The Commission has adopted as a part of its legislative program for the 88th Congress a proposal to amend section 309(c) (2) (G) of the Communications Act of 1934 to permit the Federal Communications Commission to grant special temporary authorizations for periods of 60 days in certain cases (47 U.S.C. 309 (c) (2) (G)).

The Commission's draft bill to accomplish the foregoing objective was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for its consideration. We have now been advised by that Bureau that from the standpoint of the administration's program there would be no objection to the presentation of the draft bill to the Congress for its consideration. Accordingly, there are enclosed six copies of our draft bill and explanatory statement on this subject.

The consideration by the Senate of the proposed amendment to the Communications Act of 1934 would be greatly appreciated. The Commission would be most happy to furnish any additional information that may be desired by the Senate or by the committee to which this proposal is referred.

Sincerely yours,

ROSEL H. HYDE,
Acting Chairman.

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT TO PERMIT THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION TO GRANT SPECIAL TEMPORARY AUTHORIZATIONS FOR PERIODS OF 60 DAYS IN CERTAIN CASES (47 U.S.C. 309(c) (2) (G))

Paragraph (2) (G) of subsection (c) of section 309 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47 U.S.C. 309(c) (2) (G)), now exempts from the public notice and 30-day waiting period requirements of subsection 309(b) those applications for "a special temporary authorization for nonbroadcast operation not to exceed 30 days where no application for regular operation is contemplated to be filed or pending the filing of an application for such regular operation, or."

The Commission believes that this subsection should be amended to permit it to grant special temporary authorizations (STA) for 60 days in those cases where the application for the STA is filed pending the filing of an application for regular operation. We are not suggesting any changes in the 30-day limitation on those STA's in cases not contemplating a subsequent application for regular operation.

The purpose of paragraph (2) (G) of subsection 309(c) is to permit short-term radio operation in the nonbroadcast field without the delay of a 30-day waiting period (as provided in subsection 309(b)) after the issuance of public notice by the Commission of the acceptance for filing of such application. The Commission has found that this purpose is frustrated by the 30-day limitation on STA's in those cases where the short-term operation relates to a radio system for which an application for regular operation is filed later. In those cases, the provisions of subsection 309(b) are applicable and a 30-day waiting period is required before the Commission can act on the application for regular operation. As a result, there is a hiatus between the expiration of the STA and the Commission's grant of the application for regular operation. During the period of the hiatus, the applicant would be unlicensed and would, as a consequence, be unable to operate his radio. This defeats the purpose for which Congress made special provision for granting special temporary authoriza-

tions. Moreover, it does not appear that the Commission has authority to remedy this statutory defect by renewing the STA until it can grant the application for regular operation.

The Commission believes that this deficiency in the statutory scheme can be corrected by its proposed amendment. Therefore, we recommend that paragraph (2) (G) of subsection 309(c) be amended to give us this additional authority.

DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTRICAL ENERGY GENERATED IN FEDERAL HYDROELECTRIC PLANTS IN PACIFIC NORTHWEST

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, for myself and Senators CHURCH, JORDAN of Idaho, MAGNUSON, MANSFIELD, METCALF, MORSE, and NEUBERGER, a bill to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1007) to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JACKSON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the bill I have just sent to the desk is the same bill, with two minor changes, as S. 3153 passed by the Senate last year by a rollcall vote of 51 yeas to 36 nays. This bill is cosponsored by all the Senators from the Pacific Northwest. The two changes in the bill were suggested by Governor Hatfield of Oregon in a letter to the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. Last year the bill had administration support, and I am informed that it will have such support again this year.

This bill is needed to permit the Bonneville Power Administration to market surplus power outside the Pacific Northwest on an orderly basis, and to retain its sound financial position. All segments of the utility industry in the Northwest, public and private, have agreed on the need for the legislation. This year and last year the Northwest produced a total of 27½ billion kilowatt hours of secondary energy which had to be spilled over the dams and wasted.

In dollar terms this amounts to almost \$52 million lost revenue to the Bonneville Power Administration. The Bonneville Power Administration needs these revenues to avoid a very substantial rate increase. It hardly wishes to raise its rates until every practicable step has been taken to market all the power that the dams will produce.

The Bonneville Power Administration has indicated that this bill is the key-stone to a successful marketing program. Not only will sales of surplus Bonneville power strengthen its financial position

and produce revenues for the U.S. Treasury, but also they will prevent an inexcusable waste of energy that our Nation cannot afford. In addition, such sales will bring to consumers of neighboring regions large quantities of low-cost surplus Columbia River hydroelectricity.

The power supply of the Pacific Northwest is unique in the United States because it is virtually all—96 percent—hydro. The bill just sent to the desk applies only to hydroelectricity. The great Columbia River is the prime energy source for the Northwest. Because the natural flows of the Columbia have recorded a variation of about 1 to 25 between the low- and high-water years of record, the Columbia dams produce a large amount of seasonal power. This seasonal power, that cannot be relied upon the year around, and that ceases to exist in critical water years, cannot be sold as firm power. Only a relatively small amount of it can be sold in the Northwest until the Northwest develops large steam-electric generation. But there is already a market for large amounts of it in California and the Southwest, where large steam-electric plants already exist which can firm up surplus Northwest power.

This bill lays down sensible ground rules for the movement of bulk quantities of electric energy between the Northwest and other regions. It is broad enough to permit the advantages of increased efficiency and economy that can be achieved by strong regional interties—for example, sales of surplus energy and peaking capacity, diversity exchanges, and firming power.

But it would not permit regional interties to be used to the disadvantage of the utilities and the industries of the Northwest or of any region connected with the Northwest. If firm power were needed for local utilities or industries, such power could not be transported for use 1,000 or more miles away. Many of the industries now in the Northwest have invested millions of dollars in reliance upon a continued supply of Columbia River power.

Some confusion has arisen over the relationship of this bill to the construction of extra high voltage interties. This bill does not authorize the construction of such interties by Federal agencies. Such authority already exists. Bonneville Power Administration has legal authority to construct lines anywhere within economic transmission distance of the Columbia River plants. Proposals have also been made for the construction of a Northwest-California intertie by private utilities. Public agencies in both the Northwest and California are also known to be considering the construction of a large intertie between the two regions.

The numerous advantages of economy and efficiency in the use of our Nation's energy resources made possible by strong interregional connections make some form of Northwest-Southwest intertie inevitable. Within recent months, proposals have been received by the Bonneville Power Administration from six non-Federal utility groups for the construction of an interconnection between the Pacific Northwest and the Pacific

Southwest. Regardless of who owns or operates the lines this bill is needed to provide the fullest orderly and economic movements of hydropower between the regions. With the passage of this bill, this sound national objective can be assured with great savings to electric consumers in both regions.

THE CLEAN AIR ACT

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in his health message to the Nation President Kennedy drew, in a few brief strokes, an indelible image of the terrible economic and human costs of air pollution.

Economic damage from air pollution amounts to as much as \$11 billion every year in the United States. Agricultural losses alone total \$500 million a year. Crops are stunted or destroyed, livestock become ill, meat and milk production are reduced. In some 6,000 communities various amounts of smoke, smog, grime, or fumes reduce property values and—as dramatically shown in England last year—endanger life itself. Hospitals, department stores, office buildings, and hotels are all affected. Some cities suffer damages of up to \$100 million a year. One of our larger cities has a daily average of 25,000 tons of airborne pollutants. My own home city of Boston experienced in 1960 a "black rain" of smoke, soot, oil or a mixture of all three.

It was in response to such evidence as this, that, on March 2, 1961, I introduced proposed legislation to establish a national air pollution abatement program, paralleling the newly successful Federal program for water pollution control. This measure, unfortunately, was not destined for success in the 87th Congress. But the intervening 2 years have witnessed both a dramatic expansion in technical knowledge of the enormity, complexity, and national character of the air pollution problem, and increased awareness, among public officials and ordinary citizens alike, of the profound need for remedial action.

During these 2 years, there have been major advances in the technology of air pollution control. In June of last year, for example, the Public Health Service completed the definitive study of motor vehicle air pollution which had been authorized by the farsighted provisions of the Schenck Act of 1960. This study revealed the ugly price which we are paying for the benefits of motor vehicle travel, identifying vehicular air pollution as the source of a broad spectrum of evils, from the decimation of crops and livestock to the aggravation and complication of human disease. Responding to the stimulus of this report and to the prodding of concerned Members of Congress, the Federal Division of Air Pollution Control, and States such as California, the automobile industry has made substantial progress in mitigating this hazard.

These 2 years have also brought insight into the particularly lethal role played by sulfur compounds in the air. Several recent studies have demonstrated that there exists a dramatic relationship between the levels of sulfur dioxide and sulfur trioxide in the air and the frequency and duration of the common cold and other respiratory ailments.

A series of studies carried out under the direction of Dr. F. Curtis Dohan, of the University of Pennsylvania, supported by funds from the Public Health Service, compared the frequency of colds among a group of industrial and office workers with levels of sulfates in the air of the cities where they worked.

Dr. Dohan found a striking relationship between airborne sulfate levels and the frequency with which workers were absent because of upper respiratory infections. The frequency of colds was apparently unrelated to levels of other pollutants and weather conditions. The study covered workers in eight cities in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Indiana, and the pattern of colds closely paralleled the differing sulfate levels in the eight cities.

In another investigation, scientists at the Vanderbilt University School of Medicine and the Public Health Service reported a high statistical correlation between asthma attacks and levels of sulfur dioxide in Nashville, Tenn.

Dr. L. D. Zeidberg, of Vanderbilt, and Dr. Richard A. Prindle and Mr. Emanuel Landau, of the Division of Air Pollution, found that the asthma attack rate in Nashville closely followed the measurements taken of sulfur dioxide. They reported, in addition, that variations in temperature and humidity apparently were not related to the occurrence of asthma in the group of patients studied.

There is compelling evidence that air pollution is a contributing factor in a number of chronic respiratory diseases, including asthma, emphysema, bronchitis, and lung cancer. It now appears that sulfurous air may contribute also to our most common acute respiratory disease—the cold—which last year alone cost the Nation tens of millions of lost workdays. It should also be noted that sulfur dioxide and sulfate levels have been extremely high during several acute episodes of air pollution in this country and abroad in which many people have died.

We must do all we can to pursue and encourage further research on the sulfur air pollution problem.

The Division of Air Pollution of the Public Health Service informs me that sulfur compounds in air come from certain industrial operations, such as oil refining, ore roasting, and acid manufacture, as well as from the combustion of sulfur-containing fuels. When coal or oil containing sulfur is burned in factories, powerplants, or home furnaces, substantial amounts of sulfur dioxide and tri-oxide are released into the air. These gases and other solid compounds formed from them are commonly present in polluted urban air and are highly irritating to tissue in the respiratory tract.

In addition to their adverse effects on health, sulfur compounds in the air are known to cause corrosion of metal and other structural materials and to cause injury to vegetation.

While technical methods are available generally to prevent emissions of sulfur pollutants from industrial processes, satisfactory technology is not available for preventing such emissions from fuel combustion sources, chiefly industrial

and commercial smokestacks and residential chimneys. What may be needed is more emphasis on removing sulfur from fuels before they are burned.

A report recently prepared for the Public Health Service by the Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior reviewed present techniques for removing sulfur from fuel oil. One well-known method — hydrosulfurization — can extract as much as 90 percent of the sulfur from residual oils. Residual oils represent the residue remaining after gasoline and other lighter oils have been separated from crude oil. This residual is the source of much of the fuel oil burned by industry and for electric power generation in the United States.

Although current costs estimated for removing sulfur from fuels are significant, they might prove to be much lower if greater emphasis were placed on finding improved techniques. Moreover, when these costs are weighed against the health and economic damage caused by sulfur compounds in the air, the expense would seem more than justified.

While we have not yet developed adequate techniques for controlling the levels of sulfur compounds in the air, there are today technically sound, economically feasible, and effective procedures and devices for solving other major sources of air pollution. Yet we have failed to implement them.

On the local level, with a few notable exceptions, air pollution control has been an aspiration rather than a reality. As of last summer, only 106 local air pollution control agencies could boast a full-time staff and even these agencies served a bare 45 percent of the Nation's population. Moreover, virtually all the control agencies were hampered by insufficient funds.

On the State level, 35 States still lacked coherent air pollution programs while the remaining States had programs of greatly varying efficiency. In 1961, the median annual expenditure for air pollution control was approximately 10 cents per person, an inadequate sum by any relevant standard.

December 1962 produced two significant events which may yet prove to have been the much needed catalyst for transplanting public concern over air pollution into public action.

In early December we received news of a lethal smog descending upon the hapless city of London for the second time in a decade, disrupting the life of that great city, and leaving in its wake damaged property, disease and death. During the 4-day misery of the smog, 100 persons died and a thousand more were hospitalized. It would, of course, be quixotic to claim that what happened in London could not happen here. It is happening here.

Less than a week later, the attention of the Nation was sharply focused upon air pollution by the convening in Washington of a national conference on air pollution. For several days technical experts and public health officials testified to the immediate need for a vigorous national program to combat air pollution.

It was most gratifying, and, I believe, significant, that support for legislation

such as I had proposed was forthcoming from such divergent sources as Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, President Eisenhower's Secretary of HEW, and the present president of the University of Oregon, and the American Medical Association. The American Medical Association has not, in the past, been characterized by the reckless espousal of Federal programing.

Following the conference, both the former Secretary of HEW, my esteemed colleague from Connecticut, and the present Secretary, Mr. Celebrezze, joined in supporting legislation embodying the principles contained in my earlier proposals. Finally, on February 7, President Kennedy, in his health message expressly endorsed such legislation.

During the early days of this session, I undertook to review and amend the provisions of my 1961 bill so that it might now reflect intervening advances in the science of air pollution control. To this end, I have worked closely with the distinguished chairman of the House Subcommittee on Health and Safety, Mr. ROBERTS, who has long been a champion of adequate Federal programing for air pollution abatement. The bill which I introduce today is substantially identical to legislation which he is introducing in the House.

This proposed legislation is designed, as was my earlier bill, to provide the Secretary of HEW the authority requested by President Kennedy in his health message:

(a) To engage in a more intensive research program permitting full investigation of the causes, effects and control of air pollution;

(b) To provide financial stimulation to States and local air pollution control agencies through project grants which will help them to initiate or improve their control programs;

(c) To conduct studies on air pollution problems of interstate or nationwide significance; and

(d) To take action to abate interstate air pollution, along the general lines of the existing water pollution control enforcement measures.

In addition, I am calling for a separate, intensified research effort directed toward the development of improved low cost techniques for extracting sulfur from fuels.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1009) to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution, introduced by Mrs. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

EARNINGS LIMITATION UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, proposed legislation to amend the Social Security Act by removing the earnings limitation presently imposed on recipients. As is well known, no means test is required in order to become eligible for benefits under the Social Security Act. Each person who has contributed to the fund during his working years has a right to receive

these benefits. However, a certain penalty is attached if the recipient continues to work after becoming eligible to receive payments. Beneficiaries under 72 years of age whose earnings consist of wages from self-employment income, forfeit their benefit payments in whole or in part if their income exceeds \$1,200 a year. One of the most inequitable features of this regulation is the provision which exempts from this calculation all income from investments, annuities, and pensions. In fact, it is possible to earn an unlimited amount of money in dividends and interest, and still receive one's full social security benefits. Only the person who needs to work and earn wages to supplement his social security income is penalized.

It has been estimated that 17½ million citizens of this country are over 65 years of age. This year, the Congress will consider legislation to help these citizens meet their financial obligations on reduced incomes. Members of both parties, for example, have, during this session, offered bills to provide Federal assistance to these senior citizens for meeting medical expenses. It is my belief, however, that most Americans would prefer to help themselves rather than become dependent upon the community for support. Persons between 65 and 72 can make valuable contributions to the work force, and I believe that their initiative and independence should be encouraged, and their self-reliance commended.

Let us be realistic and recognize the fact that no person can live decently on \$1,200 a year in the United States today. The income restriction provision of the law was first enacted in 1939, when the limitation was set at \$180 a year. After numerous revisions, the figure \$1,200 was reached in 1954. Although it is possible that at the time of enactment it represented a reasonable sum, it is indeed unduly frugal by our standards today.

Many would say that the only solution is an increase in social security payments, but I believe that most Americans, both recipients and taxpayers, would prefer to encourage retired persons to help themselves by earning supplemental income. The purpose of my bill is to give them that chance by removing the handicap which presently makes self-reliance impossible.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1010) to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits under such title, introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PRINTING OF "OUR AMERICAN GOVERNMENT"

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution to authorize a new printing of the document, "Our American Government. What Is It? How Does It Function?" I believe my colleagues will agree that this document is one of the

most informative and popular documents ever published by the Congress.

The author of this excellent introduction to American Government is the distinguished chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas. There are few individuals more qualified and competent to prepare such a document. Its value has been amply demonstrated by the thousands of copies that have been distributed by every Member of Congress.

I recently discovered that the last printing of this document has been exhausted. Representative PATMAN submitted House Concurrent Resolution 85 on February 7, 1963, to authorize another printing of "Our American Government." This resolution provides, as does the resolution I introduce today, that each Member of Congress will receive 2,000 copies for distribution among interested constituents.

Mr. President, I hope both Houses of Congress will take prompt action on this concurrent resolution so that "Our American Government" will be returned to circulation as quickly as possible.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 26) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That (a) with the permission of the copyright owner of the book "Our American Government—1001 Questions on How It Works," with answers by Wright Patman, published by Scholastic Magazines, Incorporated, there shall be printed as a House document the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government. What Is It? How Does It Function?" In addition to the usual number there shall be printed two thousand copies for use and distribution by each Member of Congress.

(b) As used in this concurrent resolution the term "Member of Congress" includes a Member of the Senate, a Member of the House of Representatives, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico.

**TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT
A COMPILATION OF MATERIALS
ENTITLED "SUMMER EMPLOY-
MENT OF COLLEGE STUDENTS BY
THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—
1961"**

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution providing for the printing as a Senate document of information regarding the summer employment of college students in the Federal Government excluding clerical jobs.

The college interns I have had in my own office have been of high caliber and have performed useful tasks, in the course of which I am hopeful they have added significantly to their knowledge and understanding of the legislative process. I know that my colleagues here in the Senate have been equally pleased with the work of the interns who have assisted them. In many instances the experience on Capitol Hill has motivated students to enter Government service or has reinforced their previous intent to do so.

Just as we in the Congress have been making increased use of college students during their vacation periods in recent years, the executive departments have increased their programs. Yet very little information is available concerning which departments hire students for the summer and the size of the programs in existence. Inquiries to my office indicate that students desiring to benefit from a summer's work with the Federal Government—in many instances they contribute their services without charge to the Government—do not know how to go about it. Their college advisers frequently also lack sufficient information to guide them properly.

In view of the lack of readily available information on this important subject, about a year ago I requested the Library of Congress to survey the summer intern programs for undergraduate and graduate students being sponsored by the various executive departments. I was not certain whether legislation would be necessary or desirable in this field but I felt that such a study would be of assistance in indicating the kind of action which would prove most helpful.

A questionnaire was prepared and distributed to the various departments and agencies by the Library of Congress. Miss Helen Miller, of the Legislative Reference Service staff, was assigned to do this work and has done a thorough and effective job. A great deal of her time has been devoted to circularizing the various departments and agencies and in preparing a report based on the material received. Excellent cooperation was received from the various departments.

The response has proved most useful. The Civil Service Commission has expressed an interest in the findings and a representative of at least one department has told us that prior to this survey, his department had no accurate measure of the programs being undertaken within its own jurisdiction.

My examination of the report prepared by the Library of Congress convinces me that no legislation is necessary. Further dissemination of information regarding these programs would, however, in my opinion, be helpful in guiding students and in stimulating them to seek summer employment with the Federal Government. It is with this thought in mind that I am filing this resolution asking that a major portion of the report prepared by the Library of Congress be printed as a Senate document.

This material shows, by departments, the number of positions—excluding clerical jobs—likely to be available to summer students, by location and job description. The complete report provides the names of the universities from which the students who served as interns in the summer of 1961 came. It has not been thought necessary to include this information as part of the Senate document but it will be on file at the Library of Congress. In 1961, the summer for which the study was made, a total of 12,033 jobs were reported to the Library. Though final figures are not yet available, it has been estimated

that more than 13,000 jobs will be filled by students in the summer of 1963.

With the Senate document in hand, a student and his college guidance officer can better determine the agency or office on which to concentrate in the search for a satisfactory position. Several university officials with whom the matter has been discussed have expressed the opinion that their task would be aided significantly by the publication of such a document.

I understand that the executive department is establishing a clearinghouse for these positions. As the procedure is described in the press, a student will apply to the office of his choice. If that office has filled the positions available there, the student's application will be transferred to an office where it is felt he might be useful. Publication of this document would assist the student in making a logical initial selection and should simplify the work involved on the part of the Government. I think it would increase the likelihood that students would receive assignments compatible with their interests and their skills.

I know we all feel that the continued success of our way of life requires that we recruit the best available people for Government service. I am hopeful that printing this report as a Senate document will represent a step in that direction. Since the season has arrived for students to begin making their inquiries regarding placement, I hope that expeditious attention will be given to this matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 105) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be printed as a Senate document compilation of materials entitled "Summer Employment by College Students in the Federal Government—1961", prepared by the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress; and there shall be printed six thousand two hundred additional copies of such Senate document for the use of the Members of the Senate.

**AUTHORITY TO SIGN ENROLLED
JOINT RESOLUTION DURING AD-
JOURNMENT**

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President or the President pro tempore be authorized to sign, during the adjournment following today's session, the enrolled joint resolution (H.J. Res. 284) making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**REQUIREMENT FOR CERTAIN NEW
PACKAGES OF IMPORTED ARTI-
CLES TO BE MARKED SHOWING
COUNTRY OF ORIGIN—AMEND-
MENT**

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, last Thursday I introduced four

measures to offer some relief for the American lumber industry in its fight against increased Canadian imports of softwood lumber into the United States. One of the bills I introduced at that time, S. 957, would amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require the marking of lumber and wood products to indicate the country of origin. I later found out that on the same day, February 28, a House-passed bill, H.R. 2513, was referred to the Senate Finance Committee. H.R. 2513 would amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require certain new packages of imported articles to be marked to indicate the country of origin.

In keeping with my statement that I will continue to work for relief of the American lumber industry, I today submit an amendment to the House-passed bill, H.R. 2513. This amendment would require that lumber and wood products be included under the bill as items to be marked with the country of origin.

I am also sending a letter to the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] to the effect that I would like to have this amendment considered by his committee when H.R. 2513 is up for consideration.

I hope, in this way, to expedite the handling of one aspect of legislative relief for the American lumber industry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF ARMS CONTROL ACT — ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] be added as a cosponsor of S. 777, a bill to amend the Arms Control Act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS ACT OF 1963—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill (S. 865) to provide for the establishment of the National Academy of Foreign Affairs, and for other purposes, the names of the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE], the senior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McINTYRE] be added as cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], I ask unanimous consent that upon the next printing of Senate

Concurrent Resolution 23, introduced by him on February 25, providing for the establishment of a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence, that the names of Senators BARTLETT and GRUENING, of Alaska, be added as cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of February 20, 1963, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills and concurrent resolution:

S. 861. A bill to provide for the general welfare by assisting the States, through a program of grants-in-aid, to establish and operate special hospital facilities for the treatment and cure of narcotic addicts: Mr. LONG of Missouri and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

S. 862. A bill to provide that, for purposes of certain studies, investigations, and demonstrations authorized with respect to mental illness under the Public Health Service Act, addiction to narcotics be considered as a mental illness: Mr. LONG of Missouri and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

S. 863. A bill to amend chapter 402 of title 18, United States Code, to make the Federal Youth Corrections Act applicable to certain persons who violate the Federal narcotics statutes: Mr. LONG of Missouri.

S. 864. A bill to enable the courts more effectively to deal with the problem of narcotic addiction: Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

S. Con. Res. 21. Concurrent resolution expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the matter of general disarmament and arms control: Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. FONG, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. MECHAM, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TOWER, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota.

NOTICE OF MEETING OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, section 712 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, provides that the Joint Committee on Defense Production shall be composed of 10 members, 5 of them members of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, and 5 of them members of the House Committee on Banking and Currency. The law provides that these five members from each of the committees are to be appointed by the chairman of the respective committee, three from the majority and two from the minority party.

During the last session of Congress the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Defense Production were Senators SPARKMAN, DOUGLAS, CAPEHART, BENNETT, and myself.

Senators SPARKMAN, DOUGLAS, BENNETT, and I wish to continue as members. In addition, in accordance with section 712 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, I have appointed Senator TOWER as a member of the Joint Committee on Defense Production.

A meeting of the Joint Committee on Defense Production has been called for

10:30 a.m., Thursday, March 7, for the purpose of electing officers and adopting rules for this Congress. The meeting will be held in room S-126 of the Capitol.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF THE AMERICAN INDIAN

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, I wish to announce a forthcoming hearing on the constitutional rights of the American Indian. The hearing is scheduled to begin at 10 a.m. on March 7, in room 457 of the Senate Office Building.

The subcommittee has been conducting a nationwide investigation on Indian rights since 1961. It appears from the hearings and investigations held in seven States and the District of Columbia that congressional clarification is needed to guarantee more fully Indian citizens their rights. Since a large number of tribal delegations will be in Washington during the week of March 4 to 8, the subcommittee feels it appropriate to schedule a hearing to receive the views of the tribal representatives, not heretofore represented in our study, who wish to be heard.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 537, TO CREATE A JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, BY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the Committee on Government Operations will hold hearings on the bill, S. 537, proposing the creation of a Joint Committee on the Budget on March 19 and 20, 1963. This bill was introduced in the Senate on January 25, under the sponsorship of 77 Senators. Full details relative to its purpose and objectives are set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at pages 1095 through 1101.

Outstanding experts on Federal fiscal problems will be invited to give the committee the benefit of their views and recommendations. Members of the Senate or the House of Representatives and others who may desire to be heard, or who wish to submit statements, relative to the proposed legislation should contact Mr. Walter L. Reynolds, the chief clerk of the committee, room 3304, New Senate Office Building.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS BY COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY ON DAIRY LEGISLATION—STATEMENT BY SENATOR ELLENDER ON HIS RECENT TRIP TO AFRICA

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to make two announcements. The first is that on March 18, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will begin hearings on all proposed dairy legislation before it.

The second announcement I wish to make is that on next Thursday I will present to the Senate my report on my recent tour of Africa.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Statement on the 50th anniversary of the U.S. Department of Labor.

TRIBUTES TO SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, 30 years ago a new President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, came into office. He was one of the great Presidents of our time. His contributions have been many, and the marks he left are visible even to this day.

Fifty years ago the Department of Labor came into being, under the auspices of a Republican President; and I am glad to note that anniversary today, and to commend the Department of Labor for its many fine activities through the years.

Thirty years ago, the Nation was in the midst of the great depression. It was the year in which a new President came into the White House and, with great determination and courage and with imagination and boldness in public policies, restored to the people of the United States hope in their system and in their future. One of his supporters in the election campaign which led to his election was a public-spirited Virginian.

In the same period, the same Virginian came into the Senate. From the outset, he was a man of independent views; but he understood the problems confronting the President and the Nation, and he did his part in seeing to it that those problems were faced in the Senate, and that appropriate remedies were devised.

Through the years, Mr. President, through the administrations of President Roosevelt, President Truman, and President Eisenhower, and into that of President Kennedy, the same Senator has continued to serve his State and the Nation. Sometimes he has agreed with Presidents, and sometimes he has not; but he has never failed to face the issues frankly, and to see to it, insofar as it lay within his power to do so, that the Senate faced them. That has been his hallmark.

It was 30 years ago to the day that HARRY BYRD came to the Senate. He has seen this country grow under policies which he has espoused and also under policies with which he disagreed. He has not won all the battles, nor has he lost them all. But, either way, the Nation has gained because those battles were fought.

Nor are the battles over, Mr. President. The Senator from Virginia sits as chairman of the Finance Committee at a moment when great and complex social and economic issues, involving finance, are once again in the forefront of the Nation's concern. I do not look to the Senator from Virginia to agree with the President or to disagree on every issue. I look to the Senator from Virginia to bring to these issues his own, individual

wisdom; and I look to him to see to it that these issues are faced by the Senate as a whole. Finally, I look to him—once the decisions are made by the whole Senate—to submerge his own views, to close ranks—whatever the outcome—as the great American that he is and has always been.

So, Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Virginia on his 30th anniversary in the Senate. I wish him many more battles and many more years of service in the Senate and to the Nation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to join in the statement of the majority leader concerning the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. I am indeed proud to be a Member of the Senate with him. All of us respect his views, and all of us consider him a friend. I value his friendship highly.

I hope he will have many more years of useful service, for there is no more patriotic citizen or more conscientious public servant than HARRY BYRD.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, no Senator is held in higher esteem or greater respect than our friend the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia, who today celebrates the 30th anniversary of his service in this legislative Chamber. I am honored to join with the able majority leader in saluting one who always has spoken out without hesitation, who has taken a position on all public questions, and who has followed the principles which have guided him down through the years.

I call HARRY BYRD a friend. So do my Republican colleagues, and so do my Democratic colleagues. It is not at all a question of whether one agrees with another on issues as they come before us. It is simply a question of a Senator being able to stand, to speak his piece as he sees the light, to advocate that which to him appears to be right and just. The senior Senator from Virginia has always done just that. So I rise to express my own salute and best wishes to our colleague from Virginia, and to associate myself with the remarks of my friend from Montana.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with others in commending the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] on his 30 years of valuable and outstanding service to the U.S. Senate and our Nation.

Those of us who serve with him on the Finance Committee fully understand and value his patriotic devotion to our Nation and his dedication to the preservation of the fundamental principles laid down by our Nation's Founding Fathers.

In the New York Times on April 10, 1953, Arthur Krock commented on the "rare combination of integrity, ability, courage, and specialized knowledge of complex subjects" which have given Senator BYRD a unique place in the Senate and made him its strongest force on many great and controversial occasions.

HARRY BYRD, since March 4, 1933, when he became a Member of the U.S. Senate, has been battling against deficit financing and for the "pay as you go" principle in Government. He is na-

tionally known as "Mr. Economy" and "the watchdog of the Treasury."

We need more HARRY BYRDS in the U.S. Senate if we are to preserve the solvency of the U.S. Government and preserve for future generations the great heritage we have received.

He has held many positions of honor and trust in behalf of the citizens of the great Commonwealth of Virginia. He has not betrayed their trust. In fact, during many years of service, he has proven his fidelity to public service, his independence of mind and the courage of his convictions.

Much has been written about Senator BYRD's outstanding public service, but he also has rare personal qualities. He is soft spoken, he has great personal charm; he is friendly, and those of us who work with him hold him in great affection.

Henry Drummond, in his book entitled "The Greatest Thing in the World," mentions several virtues that are evident in a true gentleman.

The first is patience, and those of us who have had the opportunity of knowing and working with HARRY BYRD know that he has unlimited patience.

In addition to patience, kindness is another virtue of a true gentleman. Generosity, humility, and sincerity are additional virtues and I am sure all my colleagues will agree with me that HARRY BYRD has all these traits.

Courtesy is another requisite of a true gentleman. To this we add unselfishness. Good temper is another attribute, and certainly those of us who know HARRY BYRD can honestly state he is not easily provoked to anger.

Personally, it is a great privilege for me to serve as a member of the Senate Finance Committee, of which he is chairman. On many occasions he has gone out of the way to be helpful to me. I am greatly indebted to him.

It is my sincere hope that he will continue to serve in this body for many years to come.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in paying respect to a man who 30 years ago first assumed his duties as a U.S. Senator. Unquestionably HARRY BYRD will go down into history as one of the Senate greats. During his service he has done more to restore and maintain a degree of fiscal responsibility than has any other man in the Congress. The American people, not only from the State of Virginia but throughout the country, owe to this man a deep debt of gratitude for his tireless service as a public servant.

His integrity and his courageous stand for what he believes is right has made his name synonymous with honesty and efficiency in government. I know of no greater tribute to be paid to this man than to say that his State, our country, and we in Congress are all better men and women as the result of the example he has set.

Members of his personal staff as well as the members of the committee staff

have asked that they be included in this tribute to a man whom they all admire and respect so highly.

As a member of the Senate Finance Committee, of which he is the chairman, and as one who has had the privilege of working with Senator Byrd for a number of years, I join Senators on both sides of the aisle not only in extending to him our best wishes but also in expressing the hope that he will be in the Senate for many years to come.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to join other Senators in paying tribute today to the distinguished Senator from Virginia, who has just entered the Chamber.

I agree with everything that has been said about him. Although he and I disagree on many subjects, we have had a warm personal friendship. We have lived in the same area as neighbors for more than a quarter of a century. I feel that I am a friend of him and his family. I join in what our majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Montana, has said about him. I desire also to wish for him many more years of health and happiness.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, service in the Senate occasionally creates images of individuals who themselves become institutions. The service that Senator Byrd has rendered to the people of his State and to the United States during the past 30 years has made him an institution. The image which represents that institution has everything in it that the American people regard as fine, good, and sound. It is an image of personal responsibility, of the ideal American who manages his affairs well, lives within his income, and is always responsible in every decision that he makes affecting himself, his family and his country.

It is an image that draws solutions from sound, time-tested principles—that considers no gimmicks, no shortcuts, no imaginative solutions based on vague theories, but returns always to the principles which the experience of centuries has demonstrated.

We live in an age when many people are looking for shortcuts. Many of us are impatient with the consequences of our own mistakes. Many of us try to find solutions which are guaranteed against failure.

Senator Byrd represents the soundness and wisdom of faith in those principles which always produce the right solution. His is an image of fiscal responsibility, an image of thrift, an image of the wisdom of living within one's income.

It has been a privilege to me for the past 10 years to serve on the Finance Committee under his chairmanship, and I am proud of the number of times I have supported the principles he supports.

I think Senator HARRY BYRD has made a tremendous contribution to his country through his service in the Senate in the past 30 years. Like the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]—and, I am sure, every other Member of this body—I hope that his service may be continued. I am sure his service has benefited our country and will continue to benefit it,

by reason of his courage, his vision, his wisdom, and his great devotion to the people he serves.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, one of the great delights which has come to me in my service in the Senate has been the association with Senator BYRD, of Virginia. While we have not agreed on all issues I hold him in the highest esteem.

If I were to speak to a class of students in political science and to advise that class what course it should follow, what principles it should adopt with respect to service to the country, I would say, "Emulate generally the example of HARRY BYRD, of Virginia." He is devoted to our country. He is devoted to the sound principles in Government. He thinks not only of the immediate but also the long-range impact of what happens in the Congress. He has been a bastion against the Congress of the United States running away from responsibility and following the star of political expediency.

It is very simple to take the easy course of spending the taxpayers' money, of being unconcerned about the future of the country, devoid of thought of the impact which fiscal policies may have in the future, but it is quite hard in the face of the tide to intermittently say, "No." HARRY BYRD has had the courage to say "No" when the political demands of the moment probably cried out for the word, "Yes."

I say to Senator Byrd, "I have been proud to serve with you. You have contributed much in keeping the brakes applied in stopping this vehicle of Government from running wildly to the bottom of the hill and destruction."

"I am proud to be with you today and proud to express these words of tribute to you."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am sure it will surprise no one if I make no unqualified endorsement of all the policies pursued by my dear friend, Senator BYRD, with whom I differ probably as often as I differ with anybody in this Chamber.

I rise especially to pay tribute to and offer congratulations to a friend—a warm friend and a very instructive friend.

I have had the privilege of differing with the Senator on issues which to me are very deep and profound, such as civil rights issues. At the same time, I have had the privilege of sitting at the Senator's desk and drawing tremendous stores of wisdom and enlightenment upon economic subjects, as to which, whether we agree or not, it has been tremendously illuminating to me to see his fine and informed mind in operation.

What too many people in the country may not know about HARRY BYRD is that he not only has stubborn conservative views about money, but also he does his homework.

Our friendship has been a great joy to me. I know enough about this body, whatever may be our differences, to know that those differences are essential to that tradition which makes America and makes for legislation in the greatest interest of our country.

So, with warmth and friendship, because our friendship is cemented in that holy of holies called the Senate gym, I rise to express my congratulations on three decades of service to my colleague, Senator BYRD.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, it has been my pleasure to follow the political career of the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia for more than two decades. I have had the great privilege of knowing him personally for some 12 to 15 years. I have had the further privilege of serving for more than 4 years on the Finance Committee, of which he is the distinguished chairman.

During all the time the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia has served in the U.S. Senate, our country has been confronted with tremendous and momentous issues of various kinds. The Senator from Virginia has been constant, dedicated, courageous, and forthright in all of his views throughout that period.

When I think of our distinguished Senator from Virginia I think of the great patriots his State has furnished our Nation. I think of Thomas Jefferson. I think of George Washington. I think of James Madison. I think of Robert E. Lee. I think of "Stonewall" Jackson. The Senator from Virginia has some of the characteristics and qualities of all of those immortal statesmen. If I were to summarize with one word the qualifications of the Senator from Virginia, I would say that he has courage.

Courage, Mr. President, is one of the most scarce commodities in the political arena of our country at the present time. The Senator from Virginia exercises courage. He does not let any combination of forces whatever in our country or in his State—the power of the executive branch, of the judicial branch, of the electorate, or anything else—deter him from acting on his convictions. The Nation admires him greatly for that characteristic. Even though some people may not agree with the political philosophy of the Senator from Virginia, all recognize his great characteristic of courage.

Then, too, he has courtesy, sound commonsense, and courtliness; he is gentlemanly in every respect. I am happy, indeed, to join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in saluting what I think is one of the outstanding political services in our Nation, that of the distinguished Senator from Virginia.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR ROBERTSON OF VIRGINIA

Mr. President, if I may, I would not wish to let this opportunity pass without pointing out the fact that the other Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] has also served in the Congress for a period of 30 years. He has not served in the Senate during that period of time, but he rendered valuable service in the other body before he was made a Member of the Senate. He now serves as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate.

WILLIS ROBERTSON also has those rare qualities I have referred to as being possessed by the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. He has

them in tremendous abundance. It has been my privilege to have been intimately acquainted with the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. We not only worked together in the legislative halls, but we have had occasion to hunt and fish together, to visit in the fields, to visit with some of his friends, constituents, and neighbors of his native State. I know of no Member of the Senate who is more beloved and dedicated than is the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia.

Mr. President, Virginia and the country are fortunate, indeed, to have this pair of dedicated public servants. I salute our distinguished colleagues. I salute Virginia. I salute our Nation.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I welcome this opportunity to join my colleagues in the Senate in extending warmest congratulations to my friend and senior colleague from Virginia, HARRY FLOOD BYRD.

It was my happy privilege to commence my political career with Senator BYRD in January of 1916, when we both entered the Senate of Virginia. I served with him there in that capacity for 6 years. Incidentally, he and I served on the committee that laid out the highway system of Virginia. He and I were joint patrons of the bill that created the highway system of Virginia; and he was the chief architect of the Virginia plan to build that splendid 55,000-mile system of highways without one red cent of public debt.

I look back first upon the service of Senator BYRD in the State senate, and later his remarkable career as Governor. Incidentally, I had the privilege of serving in his cabinet when he was Governor. In my opinion the highway system of Virginia compares favorably with that of any other State in the Union. I reflect that we have no State debt by reason of that highway system, or by reason of anything else.

Then I think of the laws Senator BYRD sponsored. He is now looked upon as a conservative, but in 1925, when he was elected Governor of Virginia, he was a liberal and a progressive. He is still a Thomas Jefferson liberal. In an interview with James J. Kilpatrick, editor of the *Richmond News-Leader*, Senator BYRD described himself as one of the last of the old New Dealers. The Democratic platform of 1932, he has asserted, was an admirable platform, adding, "I'm still standing on it."

As I look back on his career, I cannot recall any Governor of Virginia whose services to his State have been more significant than have been those of HARRY BYRD as Governor of Virginia.

Mr. President, all of my colleagues, of course, are familiar with the wonderful contributions HARRY BYRD has made here in the Senate.

Senator BYRD remarked, with regard to the Chicago platform, that it called for a reduction in Federal spending, for a renewed dedication of States rights, and for stringent economy in Government. The first bill Senator BYRD voted for in this Chamber was drafted "To preserve the credit of the U.S. Government."

Economy in Government and reduction of unnecessary Federal spending have been Senator BYRD's watchwords in all his years of service here. While the chairmanship of other committees passes from one side of the aisle to the other with each change in party majority, Senator BYRD, by common consent, has kept the chairmanship of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures ever since the committee was established, at his instance.

Those who tend to judge a man altogether by his voting record have accused him of voting with the Republicans. He, in turn, has replied that, since his name begins with the initial "B," he votes first and the Republicans then vote with him.

On one occasion, however, Senator BYRD spoke out against his critics in this fashion:

I want to tell you what kind of a Democrat I am. I am not a Republican, I will tell you that. I vote with them when they are right and against them when they are wrong, but I am not a Republican. The kind of Democrat I try earnestly to be is that kind of Democrat that two of the greatest Presidents of these United States were, both from Virginia, Thomas Jefferson and Woodrow Wilson. The kind of Democrat I try to be is the kind that Andrew Jackson was, who boasted that the proudest achievement of his administration was to pay off in toto the public debt. That is an opportunity that no one will ever have again. I am the kind of a Democrat that Grover Cleveland was, who said * * * it was the duty of the people to support the Government, and not the Government the people. The test of my vote in the Senate and my actions elsewhere, now, as they have been in the past, and as they will be in the future, is determined by what I believe to be best for my country.

That is the end of the quotation, but it is by no means the end of his concern for what is best for his country, best for his State, and best for his party.

Mr. President, I salute the senior Senator from Virginia on his 30th anniversary of service in this body, and I ask unanimous consent to have published at this point in the *RECORD* a fine tribute to Senator BYRD that was published last week in the *Richmond News Leader*.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

[From the *Richmond (Va.) News Leader*, Mar. 1, 1963]

BYRD REVIEWS TRAIL HE BLAZED IN SENATE
(By Carl Shires)

WASHINGTON, March 1.—HARRY FLOOD BYRD, the toughest rooster in Virginia's political aviary, looked back from his top-rung perch today at the 30 years that lie behind him as U.S. Senator from Virginia.

His look was a self-effacing one. There was no crow and no strut. If there was malice toward the proud young cocks whose tail feathers he'd plucked, it didn't show during an hour-long conversation in his office.

What he wanted stressed most in a story dealing with his 30th anniversary in the U.S. Senate was this:

"The people of Virginia have been mighty good to me; they've overlooked my errors; they've supported me when they thought I was right. They're the best."

LONGEST VIRGINIA TERM

Five times they've demonstrated to Senator BYRD's satisfaction that they're "the best." Five times they've voted him into

the Senate seat he holds. That's the longest time ever for a U.S. Senator from Virginia.

Monday, March 4, that's the specific anniversary date for the Senator.

On that date, three decades, two wars and four Presidents ago, he was sworn into the Senate, there under appointment of Governor John Pollard. He'd gone to fill the vacancy that came with the resignation of Claude Swanson.

A President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, was sworn in that day also. Roosevelt had picked Swanson as his Secretary of the Navy.

The new Senator from Virginia and the new President of the United States were friends. They'd known each other well while each was Governor of his State.

The friendship didn't last. Roosevelt had promised that Government expenses would be slashed 25 percent.

That's the kind of talk that impresses Senator BYRD. Promises weren't kept. Economy in Government didn't come with Roosevelt.

TRUMAN NEXT

Strike one President from the list of the Senator's favorite people.

Harry Truman was next; he'd once been Senator BYRD's Senate deskmate, but he wasn't strong on economy either.

Strike another President.

Eisenhower followed; promised surplus turned into a deficit. There went another.

And now there's Kennedy. Paraphrasing Senator BYRD, he wants to cut taxes and raise the national debt. And besides, he just recently tried to pack the Finance Committee, which the Senator heads, with a couple of members friendly to the Kennedy program.

STRIKE ANOTHER ONE

That obviously won't do; strike another.

"I've supported them all when there was an outside enemy," said BYRD, "Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Truman during World War II and Mr. Eisenhower during the Korean war. But it's been different on domestic matters."

"I think a Senator should represent his State, and I believe that Virginia still is among the most conservative States in the Union."

"And get this down, when I say conservative, it isn't a matter of money, it's a question of conserving the principles of government, the three-branch form of government, the executive, the judicial and the legislative."

CIVICS LESSON

He was off on a favorite topic. There was no trouble hearing him now. A voice that had been barely audible picked up in decibel output. His finger jabbed at the air; he took off his glasses, swiveled in his seat. He continued his lesson in basic civics:

"My greatest concern is the tremendous concentration of power in Washington. In 1776 there was born the greatest Nation the world has ever known. It did not grow great by public charity. It grew great by effort and sacrifices * * * the people ought to support the Government and not the Government the people."

He warmed still more; forefingers of both hands rent the air.

GREAT DEBTS

"And now we're having our cake and eating it too. We're passing on great debts to coming generations. It's your grandchildren and mine (he has eight) who will pay."

"Put it down that I'm completely hostile to the President's tax cut unless there's a reduction in expenditures."

One wouldn't dare not put it down.

That was the end of the Senator's easy articulation. For thereafter he was prodded into talk of self; he doesn't like to talk of self.

He'd talk of "Candy"—the sleeping cocker spaniel who lay nearby. She's 9 now, an age when dogs get uppity. She sleeps most

of the time, refuses to walk in snow, and scratches on the door as a signal to a secretary when she wants to go tend to dog business.

WON'T SPEAK ILL

He declines to talk ill of his fellow Senators, though he's not certain that the caliber's so high as 30 years ago. "But," he wanted emphasized, "I've never known a man in the Senate who's done anything improper in a financial way."

Of his constituents, he thinks the caliber's about the same as it was when he first was elected to Winchester's city council in 1908. "They still write," he grinned, pointing to a desk stacked high with mail, "when they've got something to write about."

His most formidable opponent: That honor goes to Francis Pickens Miller, his liberal opposition in the 1952 Democratic primary. Mr. Miller draws the most formidable title because he was articulate, a good speaker, and waged quite a campaign. Miller turned some buckshot verbiage on the Byrd he sought to shoot down.

PLEASANT MEMORY

The Senator's memory this time obviously was a pleasant one. A formidable foe brought out a formidable array of Byrdmen. "I beat him by 90,000 votes," he chuckled, "the biggest majority I ever got."

Though a Democrat's never beaten him in Virginia, a Republican did once. That was after the term as councilman in Winchester.

"I thought I'd done a pretty good job and I didn't campaign very hard. He beat me." There's a memory block on that one; the Senator doesn't remember the Republican's name.

POLITICAL RETURN

He got back into politics after that sobering experience by running successfully for the State senate in 1915. Ten years later he ran for Governor on the "pay-as-you-go road" issue. He won decisively and it's been pay-as-you-go in theory if not always in full fact in Virginia since.

Senator Byrd will be 76 in June. Though his suit hangs loosely from weight lost in a bout with a virus this winter, he's regaining pounds. He's got a gimp-legged walk from an arthritic knee, but still takes a daily, early-morning, 1-hour, 3-mile hike and climbs to the top of a mountain every chance he gets.

He's got an apple redness to his cheek, a quickness in his moves, and a fiery twinkle in his eye. He lets his hair go off in byways of disarray.

BORN IN MARTINSBURG

His start nearly 76 years ago came in Martinsburg, W. Va. The Senator doesn't seem inordinately proud of his West Virginia birthplace. There are no constituents there. "I was born there because my mother went over to stay with some relatives for the occasion."

He remembers it was King Street in Martinsburg, and that WILLIS ROBERTSON (Virginia's other U.S. Senator) was born on the same street, 3 blocks away.

"WILLIS," reminds BYRD, with a little sideways grin, "is right much older than I am (exactly 2 weeks)."

DEFINES POLITICS

For a definition of the "organization" he heads in the Old Dominion's politics, the Senator likes the one offered a few years ago by John Battle. It goes roughly like this: "An association of friends for the benefit of the State."

And in reference to a recent observation that the organization was held together by a thread, he retorts: "It's a mighty stout one if it's a thread."

Will he run again in 1964?

That brings an incredulous look, a "golden silence" of response, as though it's a question so naively foolish it doesn't merit attention.

Old roosters don't tell ambitious young cocks everything they know.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I could not let this occasion pass without giving a small measure of testimony, to the best of my ability, to my sincere admiration for one of the greatest Americans, at least of this generation, in the Senate, Senator BYRD of Virginia.

When I first became a member of the Senate—not as many years ago as the time when Senator BYRD entered the Senate, but nevertheless a number of years ago—I was aware of his great reputation as a farsighted, stable defender and advocate of the sound American system of opportunity and freedom.

I had great respect for him, although I did not belong to the same political party. I had the rare privilege of being assigned to a committee of which he was a member at the time, and worked under his tutelage, in effect, in attempting to assault some problems that were then beginning to assert themselves so far as the financial and fiscal affairs of this country at that time were concerned. That was in 1945.

Not only was my already conceived great respect for him amplified and, in my opinion, justified, but it has increased with every year since that time.

I agree with the fine things that have been said about Senator HARRY BYRD by other Senators. I do not know that I can add anything to those eulogies, except that I believe it to be my conscientious duty to testify publicly to that agreement, and state my affirmation of those opinions because of that association with the Senator.

No one individual—at least in what we may call modern times, whatever "modern times" may mean—has contributed more to the maintenance of a consciousness of a great segment of the American people of the fact that there is a responsibility of the individual to his government and to himself and to his community, and that that responsibility is deeply entwined with fiscal honesty and fiscal responsibility and obligations, and with a keeping of the faith by the representatives of the American people, and with the people whom they represent, than has the senior Senator from Virginia.

I feel that the overwhelming majority of the American people believe that it is not possible to spend more than is taken in and survive economically under our system of government. I feel that a great majority of the American people believe that debts should be paid, that obligations must be met. I fully believe that the great majority of the American people believe, as statesmen of the past have said, that a public office is a public trust. I believe that HARRY BYRD not only believes in those great principles, and believes in them very deeply and vibrantly, but that he has fought with as great vigor as has any other man I have ever known. He sees those principles clearly and has defended them vigorously.

A few moments ago I came to the Capitol on the subway car with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. I did not know at that time that

this was the 30th anniversary of Senator HARRY BYRD's service in the Senate. Perhaps I should have looked it up, but I did not know of it until Senator ROBERTSON told me about it. I said, "I want to hasten to the floor so that I may in my own small way testify to my admiration and appreciation."

I also said to Senator ROBERTSON that throughout the history of the United States the great State of Virginia has contributed as much as, if not more than, any other State in the Union to the stability and founding of our great Nation under a new philosophy of the dignity of man. In my experience in the Senate the representatives of the State of Virginia in the Senate have upheld that record magnificently, in the tradition of the Founding Fathers and of those who followed after them, in the preservation of this country of ours and its stability.

I know of no one who dislikes the senior Senator from Virginia. I know of a great many people who would, in the fashion of termites, undermine the basic concept of this Government and change it from a representative type of government under responsibility of the people, into a government of concentration of bureaucracies in Washington and irresponsible financial policy, and those people fear him. I do not say they dislike him. They fear him, because he stands as a great rock against the incursions of some of those philosophies into our American system. He is one of the hopes for the preservation of the basic principles, and of the responsibility of the American individual and the answerability of the Government of the United States to the American people, rather than the answerability of the people to the Government.

As I said a moment ago, I shall not indulge in more expansive eulogies, although I would, if I had the capabilities, but others have done it much better than I can.

I conclude much as I began, by saying that HARRY BYRD has my congratulations, my thanks, and my appreciation for his 30 years of service in the Senate, for his service in his sovereign State as its Governor, and as a great private citizen of that State.

I have profited as much from his example, from his courage, and from his clarity of thought in my service here as I have from any other man with whom I have been associated. I wish him well. I wish him continued years of service to his State and his Nation and continued years of health and happiness. My appreciation goes to him for the opportunity of having been able to serve with him in this body.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I congratulate Senator BYRD, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the United States of America, upon his completion of 30 years' service in the Senate. Senator BYRD's public service in the Senate and in other political offices has been characterized by a devotion to fundamental principles, by fidelity to intellectual honesty and by a degree of political courage never surpassed in the annals of the Republic.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I esteem it a privilege to say a word for a very distinguished statesman, who held up his hand in this body 30 years ago in the same week in which I held up my hand at the other end of the Capitol and took the oath of office as a Member of Congress.

His name is a household word in the Commonwealth of Virginia, where he is universally regarded with respect and affection. That respect and affection go infinitely further. If one went into the area which we traditionally describe as the rockbound coast of New England, or to the sun-drenched valleys of California, or to the area where I live, where corn and hogs and soybeans are kings, or where greening wheat covers the landscape in the Plains States—everywhere, Mr. President, HARRY BYRD is held in high respect and affection.

Perhaps it seems strange to some, who think that about him there is a Machiavellian touch, or that he is the genius behind a machine that is dedicated to reaction and standpattism, that everywhere in this country there is a genuine respect and affection and admiration for the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia.

There are many reasons for it. I think I could assign two. The first is his fidelity to principle. That is a fine, mouth-filling term. How frequently and how easily we use it—devotion to fidelity and to principle. But the fact is that the great tradition of the Republic, which has been exemplified in the contributions of this great man, runs in his veins. It comes through other great Virginians of other days, beginning with George Washington and continuing with John Randolph, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and James Monroe, whose names are constantly on the front pages long after they have gone to their eternal reward. But that is the tradition that flows in the veins of HARRY BYRD. He comes by it honestly. He has kept the faith and has kept the vigil in all of those days. It began with his service as a State senator; it continued when he was chief executive of his State; and it has continued for all the years during which he has graced the Senate of the United States. So we salute him for his fidelity to principle.

Second, we salute him on this occasion for his courage. I doubt whether anyone will deny that expediency, fear, and timidity are not unknown in the political domain. It was 120 years ago that Thomas Babington Macaulay made a speech in the House of Commons, in which he spoke of the self-interest of politicians sometimes urging them to think more of their own security and the security of their seats in Commons than of the security of the country. That kind of feeling has never blemished, has never touched, has never tarnished the thinking or the escutcheon of the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia.

It is easy to follow the expedient course in times of controversy. Obviously, people like to perpetuate themselves in office—and I am not immune to that sentiment. But what a great thing it is to look back upon a long, unscarred, un-

blemished record of doing what conviction and fidelity to principle have always dictated.

In whimsical vein, I think of the time when Clancy was on his deathbed, and the good father came to shrive him and to administer unction. He said, "Clancy, do you accept God and renounce the devil?"

Clancy studied for a moment and then said, "Father, I do accept God; but as for renouncing the devil, I am in no position to make any enemies right now."

That is a sentiment which enters into the political domain. So I salute a man who has fidelity to principle, a man whose record is one of great and naked courage in the interest of this Republic. So long as this body is graced by men and women who will bring to it that kind of courage, that kind of fidelity, the record of this Republic will be sustained.

I salute you, Senator BYRD.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to join in the tributes which are being paid to our friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia. While we may disagree on many issues, the Senator from Virginia and the junior Senator from New York have at least one thing in common: Each of us has been an unsuccessful candidate for President of the United States on the Alfalfa ticket. I am proud of that connection with my friend from Virginia.

His friendship and good will toward the junior Senator from New York—as toward all Members of the Senate—have frequently been manifested. Differences of opinion never affect the friendship and unflinching courtesy of the senior Senator from Virginia toward all his colleagues.

The outstanding quality which has been referred to by the minority leader, is his devotion to his convictions. When he has reached a conviction on any problem, he adheres to it with tenacity, with firmness, and, frequently, with success.

I join in saluting the Senator from Virginia on the anniversary of the day 30 years ago when he first took the oath of office as a Senator of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, when students of American Government in the years ahead look back to March 4, 1963, review the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and study the many eulogies which have been rendered today in respect to and in honor of the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia, they will learn a great lesson about American Government. During our years of representative government we have learned to debate and discuss the great issues of the day. We have taught ourselves how to disagree on many of the great issues without being disagreeable. We have learned how to dissent without being disrespectful.

Many of the statements which have been made today concerning the distinguished Senator from Virginia have been in the vein of great respect for this gentleman, this outstanding public servant. At the same time, the individuals expressing these sentiments of friendship, affection, and respect have indicated that on some of the issues of the day and throughout Senator BYRD's many years

of public service there has been honorable disagreement. I, for one, have disagreed with the Senator on such vital issues as fiscal and monetary policy, civil rights, and agricultural policy.

When I came to the Senate, like many other young men of that day, I knew the distinguished Senator from Virginia, who is my seatmate, as a strong conservative. I took issue with him. It is a matter of record that he also took issue with me, administered a political spanking, went on his way, and permitted me to become one of his friends.

The Senator from Virginia, as has been described today, is a true gentleman. He is a fine family man. We have visited many times. His name is known in the annals of American history, because the name BYRD is as much a part of American history as the American Revolution.

The senior Senator from Virginia is not only a student of government and economics; he is also a politician in the best sense of that word. He is a political leader and a political organizer, and he exercises political leadership when it is needed for what he believes to be the right.

The Senator from Virginia is an unquestioned patriot who is greatly admired and respected. His love of this country is second to that of no other citizen.

Previously I said the Senator from Virginia is a political conservative. We need in American politics those who can discuss the issues of the day from different points of view. Nothing would be more tragic to the American political scene than to have a monolithic political structure or political attitude. The only way in which we can discuss the important issues of fiscal policy, monetary policy, foreign policy, and domestic policy, and then come to a consensus and to some form of agreement which will gain the respect of the American people, is to have honest discussion of differences here in the legislative halls, in the Congress of the United States.

The Senator from Virginia takes his position; he mans the ramparts, and defends his position; and then he respects the decision of the majority.

I am very much pleased to be able to make this statement about him, although certainly it is not needed, because both his private life and his public life are so outstanding that tributes by his friends are not needed. The great qualities and the outstanding achievements of the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia speak for themselves.

A few minutes ago the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] stated that Senator BYRD was elected as a New Dealer. I knew that he and I had much in common, and I am delighted to know that this point of common interest has been spread on the RECORD today. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, let me say in all seriousness that Senator BYRD's record is one of fairness and fearlessness. I have done my best to try to persuade him to take the point of views I hold. I have been disappointed to find that my powers of persuasion has not been more effective. [Laughter.] On occasion I

have been saddened to learn that, despite whatever efforts I may have made and whatever eloquence I may have indulged in and whatever powers of persuasion I may have had, all of them have been for naught, insofar as persuasion of the Senator from Virginia has been concerned. However, Mr. President, let it be noted for the Record that there are occasions when the Senator from Virginia and I stand together and vote together. Those are happy occasions.

Mr. President, what is most meaningful to me is the friendship of this most distinguished gentleman, and also the fact that he has served his State and Nation for some 30 years in this great body, the U.S. Senate.

This is a most memorable day. Thirty years ago, Franklin Delano Roosevelt became President of the United States, and a new era came to America.

Thirty years ago, HARRY FLOOD BYRD became a U.S. Senator from the State of Virginia, and a record of great public service in this body was then begun.

Fifty years ago saw the establishment of the Department of Labor.

Fifty years ago saw the inauguration of one of the greatest men ever to serve the United States of America or any other free people—Woodrow Wilson. I know the Senator from Virginia is one of the great admirers of Woodrow Wilson.

Let me say that my first introduction to politics was by means of a study of Woodrow Wilson—a study which was begun at the breakfast table in the Humphrey household, when my father, a Wilsonian Democrat, would speak to his sons about Woodrow Wilson. Never did a greater man serve a free people; and I am sure the Senator from Virginia will agree with me on this day, the 50th anniversary of the inauguration of Woodrow Wilson, as President, that the American Republic is much the better because of the distinguished service of that great American.

I am sure the Senator from Virginia will also agree with me that Virginia has given many great men to America; and let me state—because of his great modesty—that HARRY FLOOD BYRD is one of them.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish to join in the tributes to the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] on the occasion of the 30th anniversary the beginning of his service in this body.

He is a thoughtful gentleman. He is always appreciative of the point of view of others. He takes time to talk with and advise younger Senators.

While we may disagree on some subjects, such disagreement has always been in a friendly spirit. Indeed, Senator BYRD is one of the outstanding statesmen of our time.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleagues in honoring the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] as he begins today his 30th anniversary of service in the U.S. Senate. I deem it a high privilege and honor to have been able to serve in the Senate, for a little more than 8 years, with this distinguished Vir-

ginian, whom I rank among the greatest statesmen the State of Virginia, and this Nation, have produced. I realize, Mr. President, that in making this statement that I am ranking the Senator with America's top alltime statesmen, and this is my intention.

Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD is one of the most capable and most respected Senators ever to serve in this great body, and he has earned the accolades of his colleagues and millions across this country, despite the fact that he has refused to conform to the party line or any line except the dictates of the conscience of HARRY FLOOD BYRD. I doubt seriously, Mr. President, if there have been many—if any—Senators who, when they announced their intention to retire, ever received more pleas from their colleagues, their fellow countrymen, and from their own States to offer for reelection and continue serving in the U.S. Senate. I recall well in 1958 how the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia was virtually drafted to run for reelection to the Senate by the Virginia Legislature and the Members of this body.

Since that time, when he was reelected by an overwhelming margin of victory, Senator BYRD has continued to serve with distinction, courage, and effectiveness the people of Virginia and the United States of America. He has won respect from friend and foe alike for the strong leadership he has exerted in this country for sound Government financing, as the chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and the Senate Finance Committee. He is also highly regarded for his long record of service as a ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, on which I have the honor to serve with him.

I take great pleasure, Mr. President, in paying tribute to the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia. I wish him many more years of capable and dedicated service to his State and Nation. I was most encouraged and pleased to read in U.S. News & World Report this morning that the Senator from Virginia is expected to seek reelection in 1964, as much as he deserves to enjoy a well-earned retirement from his long and illustrious record of public service, which dates back to 1915 when he was elected to the Virginia Senate. I urge that he offer for reelection and that if necessary, he again be publicly drafted to continue providing this country with his wise counsel on fiscal sanity and his effective service as a Member of the greatest deliberative body in the world.

ASIA'S FRONTIERS OF FREEDOM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, recently there has appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the Washington Star, and other newspapers, a series of articles entitled "Asia's Frontiers of Freedom." The articles, written by Richard Dudman, are based upon his journey of observation in the southeast Asian region. These articles constitute

a job of first-rate and careful reporting on this region, in which we are deeply involved and about which we are inadequately informed. I commend these articles to the attention of the Senate. They are worth reading and studying in connection with our legislative responsibilities. I ask unanimous consent that the articles be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch,
Feb. 3, 1963]

ASIA'S FRONTIERS OF FREEDOM—U.S. POLICY: PLUSSES, MINUSES, AND QUESTIONS—HARD GOING FOR YEARS INDICATED IN FIGHT TO ROLL BACK RED CHINESE

(By Richard Dudman)

(First of a series)

American policy along the rim of China can best be characterized as a holding operation.

It is really not a single policy, but a collection of different policies.

It supports the national leaders—mainly dictators—who say they are for us and against communism. It sometimes helps and sometimes ignores the leaders—also mainly dictators—who call themselves neutrals. It frowns on a third group of dictators, those who side with the Communists.

It guarantees the territory of Chiang Kai-shek, joins with China and the Soviet Union to support a neutral coalition government in Laos but hesitates to give similar assurances when Cambodia requests them. It spurns altogether a request for diplomatic relations with Outer Mongolia.

The best that officials in Washington can do to give coherence to these varying and sometimes contradictory policies is to say that the United States is supporting and strengthening the "free nations" on China's periphery. They say that inconsistency is inevitable; different situations require different policies.

The aim, in short, is to contain Chinese expansionism, just as the overall postwar policy toward the Soviet Union has been to contain Russian expansionism.

(Some officials object to the term "containment" as being too negative. They say American policy is to "check and roll back" Communist expansion by both the Soviet Union and mainland China.)

A corollary is and has been that we will accept virtually any ally, no matter how repressive or unpopular, so long as he is reliably anti-Communist.

Popular revolts have overthrown two such leaders in recent years—Nuri Said in Iraq and Syngman Rhee, in South Korea, but supposed stability and anticommunism continue to be put before popularity and independence.

Under the Kennedy administration, as under the Eisenhower and Truman administrations, American policy with respect to China is essentially a negative, short-run course of reaction to Chinese initiatives, whether aggression or subversion.

American policy no longer looks for any early collapse of the Communist regime in China. "Only two people expect a collapse—Chiang and Joseph Alsop," runs a current quip that expresses the prevailing view.

Nor does current policy look toward a day when China may be brought into the community of nations and at least go through the motions of seeking world peace.

Positive aspects of American policy consist mainly in helping build the economies of the non-Communist nations bordering China and specifically in helping make India a beacon of hope that will outshine Communist China in Asian eyes.

How well is all this working? And if it does work, is it enough?

To answer these questions, the Post-Dispatch sent a reporter-photographer team on an 11-week tour of southeast Asia and India, to observe, ask questions, and take pictures.

Their conclusions are a number of plusses and minuses and some question marks. They add up to a bleak total—hard going in the next months and years, and no end in sight. Barring a major reappraisal of the American role in Asia, the greatest hope lies in Chinese blunders and misfortunes.

The worst of the present problems is Vietnam. American Armed Forces are actively engaged in the only current shooting war along China's border. They are advising, supporting, and occasionally fighting in a war against Communist-led insurgents trying to overthrow the government of an unpopular but anti-Communist dictator.

Too many blunders or misfortunes on the American and South Vietnamese side could bring a military disaster that would make the abortive Bay of Pigs in Cuba look like a beach party.

Some of the participants and observers in Vietnam maintain the standard view of cautious optimism. Public statements by officials along this line must be discounted, however. Techniques of psychological warfare call for attitudes of confidence and predictions of success, all calculated to create an air of victory and to discourage support for the enemy.

But others express an uneasy feeling that the operation in Vietnam may go the way of the operation in China in 1949, when Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist soldiers sold their American weapons to the Communists and lost China by default.

The U.S. part in the operation involves about 11,000 American troops. They are called advisers, but they are risking their lives alongside combat forces and sometimes take part in combat.

The war is costing the United States roughly \$2 million a day—\$1 million in military and economic aid to Vietnam and possibly another \$1 million in American troops and the arms, trucks, planes, and supplies they are using directly.

Official casualties since January 1, 1961, now stand at 63 dead, including 24 killed in combat, and 90 wounded.

On a purely military level, the operation showed evidences of improvement in recent months. But it has just suffered a stunning setback.

The insurgent Vietcong (short for Vietnamese Communists), had seemed unwilling or unable to mount big offensives like those of a year ago. Moreover, although they still were capturing weapons from Government forces, the rate had slowed; a year ago Government forces were losing twice as many as the insurgents, whereas until recently the numbers had begun running about equal.

Then came the January 2 counterattack by 500 Vietcong in the rice paddies of the southern Mekong Delta. The attackers turned a routine troop-lift operation by the Government into a shambles, shooting down 5 helicopters, and killing 3 Americans and 65 Vietnamese.

Other major battles in the next few days increased the Vietnamese dead to 122 and resulted in the capture of hundreds of prisoners and sizable stocks of arms by the enemy.

Some officials in Washington sought to offset the losses by citing unconfirmed claims by the Government in Saigon that 101 Vietcong had been killed. The figure later was raised to 140. The Washington officials called the episode perhaps a standoff but certainly not a defeat. They said it differed from past enemy actions in that the Vietcong had not initiated the attack but had been forced into a defensive action.

Observers at the scene, however, know how unreliable are the Vietnamese reports of enemy casualties, a hodge-podge of accuracy, wishful thinking and speculation based on such things as blood spots on the ground. What bodies are found and counted as enemy dead are often those of innocent peasants mistaken for Vietcong or killed by accident.

The big battles last month gave new evidence that the fight for Vietnam will be long and difficult, that it must go on for at least another year before we can know whether the operation has even a reasonable chance of success—and that it may be lost entirely.

All involved in the campaign in Vietnam agree that it can be won only by a combination of military and political means. The American advisers say it, American diplomats say it and American aid officials say it. So do the three powerful figures that run the Vietnamese regime—President Ngo Dinh Diem; his brother and political counselor, Ngo Dinh Nhu; and Nhu's outspoken wife.

They are familiar with Mao Tse-tung's doctrine that a guerrilla army moves among the people like a fish swimming through water. The guerrilla depends on the support he gets from the peasants, whether through persuasion or coercion.

President Kennedy was expressing the same thought when, as a Senator in 1954, he said, "I am frankly of the belief that no amount of American military assistance in Indochina can conquer an enemy which is everywhere and at the same time nowhere, 'an enemy of the people' which has the sympathy and covert support of the people."

Breaking the Vietcong's hold on the peasants is the central problem in Vietnam. To solve it, the United States and the Diem regime have joined in a "strategic hamlet" program, in which a widening network of protected settlements is spreading slowly across the country.

Each strategic hamlet is surrounded by a fence of sharpened stakes or barbed wire. Often there are two fences and, between them, a moat filled with poisonous cactus or short spikes to pierce the feet of intruders.

The hamlets' threefold purpose is to protect the peasants from the Vietcong; to separate the Vietcong from its sources of food, weapons and recruits, and to instill loyalty and respect for the government.

American political and military advisers place great importance on the last feature. Their theory is the same as that of British Field Marshal Sir Gerald Templer in the campaign against Communist-led insurgents in Malaya in the 1950's: "This is a battle for the hearts and minds of men."

They want the armed villages to work in two directions in building a new relationship between the people and the government. They want the people to be organized into an effective loyal supporting force that will supply food, manpower and intelligence to the government, instead of to the enemy. They believe this can come about only if the government makes itself the friend and protector of the people and gives them a stake in its management and survival.

Officials of the Vietnamese Government express similar views, but their actions show that they consider the hamlet program a military device first of all and a political device only as a poor second.

A limited land reform program; an American-assisted project to help each family raise a pig; hamlet elections, in which there rarely is an opposition slate; occasional free medical service and agricultural advice from a traveling civic action team—such measures have not yet had important effect in swinging Vietnamese peasantry to the side of President Diem.

A peasant woman in the central highlands spoke for many others when she said: "I've been lucky this month. The Vietcong, didn't seize my rice and neither did the Vietnamese Army."

The truism seems to hold good that the peasant just wants to be let alone.

When the Vietcong, harassed by helicopter raids and rockets and napalm, begins stealing rice in an area, the peasants sometimes move out in a body and take refuge in a new fortified settlement provided by the government with American help and financing.

When the government steps up the draft or uproots families to force them to move into strategic villages, menfolk often disappear into the jungles and paddies to join the Vietcong.

A disturbing fact of the war thus far is that, at the best estimate, the number of armed Vietcong guerrillas remains at about 23,000, even though the government claims a weekly kill of around 500. Recruiting of new guerrillas inside South Vietnam seems to offset losses through casualties.

The tide will have turned when peasants begin stopping army convoys to warn them of an ambush ahead; when young men in large numbers, instead of mainly women and children and old persons, enter the relocation camps, voluntarily; when the women of a raided Vietcong village say, "They went that way," instead of replying with a blank look when asked where the guerrillas fled.

If the tide fails to turn, if the cautious optimism voiced by top officials fails to develop a solid basis, then what?

Some of the men actually engaged in the undeclared war do not share the view expressed by President Kennedy in his state of the Union address that "the spearpoint of aggression has been blunted in Vietnam." They are restless under the present restrictions and would like to see American forces in either full combat status or withdrawn altogether.

There can be no doubt of the firmness of the American commitment. Vice President Richard M. Nixon spoke for a Republican administration in 1953, at an earlier stage in the struggle for Vietnam, when the United States was trying to persuade the French to keep fighting.

"Under no circumstances could negotiations take place that would place people who want independence under bondage," Nixon said. "It is impossible to lay down arms until victory is completely won."

In similar words, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy stated the Kennedy administration's position a year ago in Saigon: "We are going to win in Vietnam. We will remain here until we do win."

Responsible officials have been frank and realistic in warning that the war would be long and bloody.

Adm. George W. Anderson, Jr., Chief of Naval Operations, told a congressional committee a year ago: "I would not minimize the fact that we are going to lose helicopters and we will lose airplanes, and we will probably have people killed, Americans killed and wounded and perhaps captured. You cannot provide this type of assistance, which is absolutely essential, without some bloodletting."

But if the war sinks into a stalemate, possibly along the lines of the French experience in Algeria, it is questionable how long the effort would remain acceptable to the American people or to a President who likes to see foreign problems solved promptly, particularly if they carry political disadvantage at home.

No reappraisal of U.S. policy in Vietnam is in sight yet. Grave doubts are expressed by some American officials in Washington and in southeast Asia, but not by those who have real power in the Kennedy administration.

If the situation does eventually reach the point of thorough reappraisal, three other main courses are available:

1. Send in far more American troops and commit them fully to combat.
2. Withdraw support from Diem in hope that a more popular national leader will

emerge and lead the country in a successful independence.

3. Negotiate a settlement, possibly under the Geneva agreement of 1954, which provided for the military neutralization of Vietnam and its eventual reunification.

The first choice seems unlikely at present. Pentagon and State Department officials deny flatly a recent report that American authorities in Saigon have recommended that United States forces take over combat command in Vietnam.

The Defense Department, moreover, has long opposed the large-scale commitment of American combat forces in southeast Asia, except as a last resort. Military difficulties would be formidable. The possibility of triggering World War III would be enormously increased.

Finally, the spectacle of a white man's army fighting Asians in Asia would play into Communist hands by supporting the propaganda line that portrays the United States as an imperialist, neocolonial power that mistreats its own racial minorities at home and tries to subjugate dark-skinned peoples abroad.

Few Americans involved in the Vietnam operation consider Diem an ideal leader, but there is no one in sight who might become an ideal leader to replace him. If Diem should go, his most likely successor would be the army—a military dictatorship along the lines of that in South Korea.

As for negotiated settlements, they have never satisfied those who make American policy; they have been accepted only as a last resort. Korea was negotiated only to end a long and bloody war bogged down in hopeless stalemate. Laos was negotiated only after the humiliating military defeat of the American-backed rightists.

Reluctance to negotiate sometimes means that the United States has only a weak position by the time it reaches the conference table. Some believe that is the only possible eventual outcome of the fighting in Vietnam.

Vietnam and most of the other countries of southeast Asia emerged only recently as independent states in an area that has known little but foreign rule and bitter internal rivalries.

Japanese occupation in World War II spelled the end of colonial rule throughout southeast Asia. French Indochina was among the first of the colonial possessions to break up. Immediately after the Japanese surrender, Ho Chi Minh, heading the Vietminh, a Communist-led Vietnamese nationalist coalition, established a government and declared Vietnam independent.

That touched off the 9-year war with the French, which ended with the Geneva accords of 1954. The Vietminh seemed headed for a complete takeover of Indochina. Communist China, after first being cool to the Vietminh campaign, began supplying encouragement, support, and finally the training and guns that defeated the French at Dien Bien Phu.

With a Communist victory in sight, the Soviet Union moved to shut down the war, partly as leverage to prevent creation of a European Defense Community, partly out of fear of the "massive retaliation" policy of John Foster Dulles, and possibly also to maintain Soviet influence in the area instead of letting it go entirely to the Chinese.

Russia joined Britain and France in pressing for a compromise end of the fighting. As a result of negotiations at Geneva, Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia were declared independent and were neutralized militarily. Vietnam was to be divided temporarily, pending national elections in 2 years for a unified government.

The Geneva settlement was signed by 14 nations, including Communist China, North Vietnam, France, and the two conference chairmen, Britain and the Soviet Union. It provided for the withdrawal of Viet Minh

and French troops to their own sides of the 17th parallel. It prohibited the entry of additional troops or military equipment except for replacement of what was there already. Neither zone was to join any military alliance or permit any foreign bases on its territory.

Neither the United States nor South Vietnam would sign the accords. The American delegation merely took note of them and stated that the United States would "refrain from the threat or the use of force to disturb them."

Both sides have violated the agreements. South Vietnam, with American encouragement, refused to discuss unification elections. North Vietnam has been encouraging and supporting the Vietcong insurgents in the south. U.S. troops and arms have been sent in far beyond the Geneva limits.

The Indian-Canadian-Polish control commission set up to police the agreements has found both sides in violation, although it said North Vietnam started the trouble. The commission's report criticized both parties' refusal to allow commission inspectors free movement.

Communist activity in Laos has been similar to that in South Vietnam. The insurgent Pathet Lao has received help, encouragement, and leadership from the Viet Minh in its efforts to take over the country. The main difference has been that there was no strong Laotian government willing and able to drive out the Communist influences and unify the country.

Until near the end of the Eisenhower administration, U.S. strategy in Laos was to try to make it an anti-Communist bastion, part of a containment line around China and a protection to the regimes in South Vietnam and Thailand.

There were signs of change just before Mr. Kennedy's inauguration. The Pentagon inspired newspaper stories that military intervention would be extremely difficult, that Laos was not worth fighting for, and that Prince Boun Oum, the rightist leader backed by the United States, had little popular support.

An abrupt change came when the rightist forces turned and ran from the Pathet Lao. President Kennedy's choice was complete military defeat, partition, or a neutralist coalition.

Acting out of necessity, the administration entered negotiations to neutralize Laos. Again the Soviet Union cooperated to help close down a civil war that had been virtually won by the Communists. Ironically, the United States now pins its hopes for peace and stability on a neutralist coalition headed by Prince Souvanna Phouma, whom the Central Intelligence Agency had helped out twice in 5 years.

The result so far, somewhat better than had been expected, is actual partition of the country under a weak tripartite central government. Each faction has its own army and guards its own territory. The three factions have agreed to merge these forces and create a national police force, but the plan has not yet been carried out.

Government leaders in Thailand, like those in South Vietnam, regard the neutralization of Laos as a sellout by the United States.

They asked for help last May, when the fighting in Laos threatened to spill over into Thailand, and President Kennedy sent in 4,000 troops. Six months later, with the crisis past, the Thais asked privately that the troops be withdrawn. They departed last November but left behind their barracks and heavy equipment in readiness for a quick return if necessary.

Two other neutralist countries in the area, Cambodia and Burma, go their own ways, accepting aid from East and West. Their neutralism extends within the Communist bloc, too; they take aid from both China and Russia. They are more preoccupied with

their own immediate problems than with some eventual threat of Chinese Communist expansion.

Off to the west, around the arc of China's southern border, the United States has embarked on another commitment that could surpass in cost and effort and lives the commitment in Vietnam. The United States is backing with arms and advice the new Indian determination to contest Chinese territorial claims in the high Himalayan border country.

Asians are watching these various American operations on their continent, as well as the continued backing of Chiang Kai-shek and his dreams of returning to the mainland; the encouragement of Japan's shift away from the extreme pacifism that followed the World War II defeat; the cold-shouldering of Outer Mongolia's overtures for diplomatic relations with the United States, and the adamant insistence on keeping China out of the United Nations.

America's future in Asia will depend partly on American techniques of using its aid and showing its strength. More importantly, it will depend on a correct reading of the Peking-Moscow split, China's motives in attacking India, China's capacity to survive as a nation, North Vietnam's role as a satellite of China or something more nearly approaching Yugoslavia, and the true nature of insurgent movements such as the Vietcong and the Pathet Lao.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Feb. 4, 1963]

ASIA'S FRONTIERS OF FREEDOM—COMMUNIST-LED VIETCONG FIGHTING ON SHOESTRING WITH HOMEMADE OR CAPTURED GUNS—MODERN WEAPONS FROM CHINA COULD CHANGE COURSE OF WAR, IN WHICH 11,000 AMERICAN MILITARY MEN ARE AIDING THE SOUTH VIETNAMESE

(By Richard Dudman)

(Second of a series)

An American B-26 combat plane shot down a few weeks ago in the Mekong Delta told much about the nature of the undeclared war in Vietnam.

Before American or Vietnamese troops could reach the scene, the insurgent Vietcong had stripped the plane clean of ammunition, radios, first-aid kits, even the clothes off the bodies of four dead American crew members. Most important, the guerrillas got eight 50-caliber machineguns.

From that day on American and Vietnamese intelligence and operations maps have carried small crosses, sometimes along the east coast of the Camau Peninsula, sometimes inland along the many canals through the rice paddies.

The moving crosses mark reports and rumors of where those eight lost guns have been sighted or are believed to be. They are supposed to have been camouflaged and mounted on sampans. Not one has been spotted for sure.

Helicopters must fly higher when they approach places marked with the crosses. Airborne Vietnamese troops give them a wide berth.

The eight captured machineguns are important because they are so much better than most other Vietcong weapons.

A gun of the same caliber, which Americans captured in the delta area, was a handmade weapon, constructed of a length of pipe, a carved teakwood stock and hand-forged firing parts, made to shoot captured shells one at a time.

Chinese automatic weapons are scarce. Mostly the Vietcong carry captured American carbines or rifles, firearms left over from the war with the French, or else one-shot weapons they have made for themselves.

An American helicopter returned recently from a flight over Vietcong territory with a steel crossbow arrow stuck in its fuselage.

One of the most effective antihelicopter weapons is simply a forest of 15-foot stakes planted in any open area where the helicopters are expected to land. These "rotor bumpers" force pilots to slow their landings to avoid damaging their rotors or impaling the thin bellies of their planes on the stakes.

When a ground force with an American adviser marched into upper Phu Yen Province north of Saigon to remove and burn thousands of the poles, Vietcong forces moved in at the other end of the area and began pulling them up and hiding them. As soon as the Government troops left, the guerrillas began replanting the helicopter trap.

The concern over the eight machineguns shows that, with little additional effort, China or North Vietnam could feed enough modern weapons into South Vietnam to change the whole course of the war.

The bloody Vietcong counterattack in the delta last month, in which 5 helicopters were shot down and 65 Vietnamese and 3 Americans were killed, gave further indication of what a few modern guns can do in enemy hands.

The Communist-led Vietcong is fighting on a shoestring. Some American officials speak of massive infiltration of North Vietnamese troops and weapons along the so-called Ho Chi Minh trail through Laos and even far south through Cambodia.

Other sources, well-informed Western officials, discount this infiltration and insist that the Vietcong now gets its new manpower and weapons mainly from inside South Vietnam. Part of the confusion on this point, says a Canadian observer, is that American intelligence on the subject comes mainly from Vietnamese sources, which often exaggerate.

American military experts in Cambodia and Laos say it would take 15 American divisions to seal off the wild, unmarked border between Vietnam and Cambodia. But they say there would be no need to do that, since there is only a little movement back and forth, nothing of military significance.

They deny entirely the Vietnamese claim that an extension of the Ho Chi Minh trail extends down through Cambodia. They assert that this would be needlessly difficult when the Vietcong has easier access through Laos.

It is true that the Vietcong gets much of its direction, many of its leaders and much of its propaganda encouragement from Hanoi, the capital of North Vietnam.

But the insurgents' continuing numerical strength, their material support and their vitality as a guerrilla army come mainly from the South Vietnamese peasantry. They obtain this support partly through terror, partly through ignorant fanaticism that believes charges of "American imperialism," partly through real grievances against the regime in Saigon and partly through the peasants' choice of what they see as the easiest path at the moment between two evil forces.

Guerrilla prisoners of war often say they were forced into the Vietcong by threats against themselves or their families. Some American officials conclude that the Vietcong relies exclusively on terror. But such statements can be self-serving; no prisoner is likely to say he joined the guerrillas because he thought they were on the right side.

It is a dangerous oversimplification to call the Vietcong merely a tool of international communism.

Propaganda statements out of Hanoi and Peking lead some to believe the Vietcong is nothing more than a tool of international communism. It is that, but it is also an expression of Vietnamese nationalism, drawing on indigenous sources for its strength.

The same can be said of Ho Chi Minh, president of Communist North Vietnam. He turned to communism after trying unsuccessfully at the Versailles conference to

qualify Vietnam for Woodrow Wilson's principle of self-determination. After World War II, he turned first to the United States and Nationalist China for support for his independence movement.

Even now, he is above all else a Vietnamese nationalist. He maintains a degree of independence of Communist China and the Soviet Union, while siding with them and accepting their aid.

A minority view in the State Department holds that the United States is overlooking a good bet in not making some overture to Ho Chi Minh, some appeal to his Vietnamese nationalism that might override his ties to China and Russia.

In this view, he might be inclined to seek trade and eventually a truly neutral coalition with South Vietnam in hopes of building a strong nation that could be independent of China.

Current American policy, however, runs in the opposite direction and is devoted to wholehearted support of President Ngo Dinh Diem, regardless of his widely conceded shortcomings as a national leader.

The extent of American military involvement is an open secret. No official reports are given out on the number of men and weapons committed to the undeclared war. The secrecy stems from the fiction kept up by both East and West that they are abiding by the Geneva agreement of 1954, which prohibited additional troops or arms in the area.

The United States refused to sign the accords but promised to "refrain from the threat or use of force to disturb them." If it admitted publicly the extent of its aid to South Vietnam, it would be making a case for the Communists to charge violation.

Thus it was only unofficially that spokesmen disclosed that "about 11,000" American troops were in Vietnam. They did not make clear whether or not this figure includes the hundreds or thousands of troops on temporary duty from Okinawa or other American bases in the Far East.

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara testified last week, however, that "there is now a total of more than 11,000 U.S. military personnel in Vietnam, providing training, airlift, communications, and advice to Vietnamese forces, and administering the military assistance program."

Officials explained afterward that the American forces are a temporary buildup, needed because the Communists had violated the limitations of the 1954 agreements, and would be withdrawn whenever the Communists withdrew.

No figure is being given out for the total cost of the operation. American military and economic aid to South Vietnam is running at about \$1 million a day. How much it costs in addition to pay, feed, transport, supply the American forces is an unanswered question.

"It would be impossible to give a figure even ballparkwise," said a Pentagon spokesman.

The Pentagon approach is to point out that the troops in Vietnam would be getting their salaries, food, and other benefits somewhere else if they were not in Vietnam. By this reasoning, no military operation costs anything but transportation.

A reasonable estimate would be another \$1 million a day, including additional operating costs and the sizable losses of planes and other equipment and expenditures of American ammunition.

Confusion also surrounds the precise role of the American forces in Vietnam. Officially they are nothing but "advisers," engage in no combat, shoot only when fired at, and fly armed planes only when accompanied by at least one Vietnamese.

Actually, they frequently are involved in combat. The never-shoot-first rule is broadly interpreted—"You can always say,

"There goes a burst," explains a realistic American captain.

An official statement, posted at an American helicopter base, allows the same leeway:

"There is no change in the status of American advisers in Vietnam. They remain advisers, not combat troops. They are authorized by the President of the United States to return fire to protect themselves or other Americans when fired upon.

"This decision can only be made by the individual on the scene in light of the immediate and specific circumstances pertaining at a given moment."

The Arvin (short for Army of Vietnam) observer who is supposed to accompany the Americans in the new combat helicopters is often regarded as just so much surplus baggage. He is left behind if he is slow in appearing for a flight, or if Americans need all the seats.

American fliers often find the restrictions an annoyance and believe they are fully justified in blasting an entire village with rockets and machineguns if a man in black pants steps out of a shack and fires at a circling helicopter.

Here is the way an American officer discussed a mission in one of the new HU-18 armed helicopters:

"We took a couple of bursts of automatic weapon fire from a village and then small arms fire opened up from all over. We were ready to shoot back, but we had a general aboard who ordered us not to. He said, 'Don't shoot back—you might hit some innocent women and children'.

"Now, one way to look at it is that maybe 10 Vietcong were in the village and they were the ones doing the shooting and the rest of the villagers shouldn't have to suffer for it.

"But another way to look at it is that if those villagers are harboring 10 Vietcong they aren't really neutral. Besides, if the VC can fire at us without getting something back in return, it sets a bad precedent and makes them think they can get away with anything.

"We called for an air strike and some fixed-wing aircraft went in with rockets and napalm and really clobbered that village.

"The general was sore, of course. He wanted to know who ordered that air strike. We said we didn't know—it just came over the radio, might have been from the Arvin."

Operations from the air are not always so precise. Some fliers say they fire at any group of black-clad figures on the ground if they look suspicious and if a nod of approval can be obtained from an Arvin observer.

A common rule of thumb is that anyone in black pants who is running must be a Vietcong.

"They must be guilty or they wouldn't be running," explained an American officer. "Besides, President Diem has ordered them to stand still when they see a plane."

The disastrous helicopter ambush of January 2 gave new evidence of some basic shortcomings in the Vietnamese operation as a purely military exercise.

American military advisers charge repeatedly that Vietnamese soldiers are poor shots and lack aggressiveness.

"They're short on two ships—leadership and marksmanship," says an American captain, repeating one of the GI gags that sums up a widespread view.

According to a common complaint, Vietnamese soldiers hit the dirt at the first sound of gunfire, instead of advancing and returning the fire according to the antiguerrilla training they have been given.

The advisers also report repeated instances of arriving in helicopters at a "drop zone" with a second group of Vietnamese troops to find the first group busy cooking their lunch and preparing for a siesta instead of chasing the enemy.

"Sometimes I think these people are laughing up their sleeves at us," said a soldier who had seen such incidents. "Maybe we ought to charge them an amusement tax and get back at least part of what this is costing us."

Top officials take a more tolerant view. They point out that habits are hard to change and that the Vietnamese have been fighting one or another enemy for the last 20 years and cannot be expected to have the same sense of urgency as a soldier who has been assigned there for a year and wants to see a quick victory.

They recall the irritable complaints by Americans in World War II that British fighting men always stopped for tea.

Two new weapons, added to the war in the last year, were expected to turn the tide. Helicopters have permitted rapid envelopment of an enemy stronghold, and the tank-like M-113 amphibious personnel carrier, with aluminum armor plate and chain tread, has helped pursue the elusive Vietcong through the canals and rice paddies of the southern delta area.

But the new vehicles add further to the dependence of the Vietnamese army on modern carriers to fight a shadowy enemy who has only his gun and his bag of rice, who travels on foot, and who is willing to crouch for hours under water with leeches clinging to his body, breathing through a bamboo tube, so that he can live to fight again.

An American lieutenant colonel, back from a ground operation in which two companies of Vietnamese had chased a group of Vietcong through the jungle in a rainstorm, said afterward:

"This was only a sweep. You couldn't call it a clear-and-hold operation. We can't hold it, because there are no roads and these people depend on roads.

"Take away the jeeps and trucks and let them fight like the VC, and we could beat them a lot sooner."

The helicopters also were expected to work as a lever to give the American advisers a hand in the planning of operations against the Vietcong. The Americans had rarely been able to get a look at a plan before the mission began.

By providing the transportation, it was thought, the American officers would have something approaching a veto over the grandiose "sweeps" so often employed by the Vietnamese. These drives through Vietcong territory merely harass the enemy and do nothing toward extending the area under reliable government control.

But the expected leverage has not worked. The sweeps continue and the advisers still complain that their advice is often disregarded.

Official comments are more optimistic. After the wave of complaints last month about the Vietnamese army, Gen. Paul D. Harkins, the top U.S. commander in South Vietnam, said anyone who criticized the fighting qualities of the Vietnamese armed forces was "doing a disservice to the thousands of gallant and courageous men who are fighting in the defense of their country."

He said 10,000 South Vietnamese soldiers had been killed in action in the last year and that almost 30,000 dead Vietcong insurgents "attest to their courage."

Official estimates of the military operation are influenced by the needs of psychological warfare. An essential to victory is swinging the peasants to Diem's support. They will swing if they think he is winning. Hence, there is a policy of deliberate optimism.

Important visitors also are given a rosy view of the hamlet defenses by being taken to a few demonstration hamlets, where the peasants have been put through their emergency drill in front of so many visitors and cameras that they no longer want to work

but sit around waiting for the gong to sound for the next drill.

In the last few months of 1962, the standard phrase for the war in Vietnam came to be "cautious optimism."

The rash of new mass attacks by the Vietcong has given more reason for caution and less reason for optimism. Victory, even in a purely military sense, is not yet in sight.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, February 5, 1963]

ASIA'S FRONTIERS OF FREEDOM—U.S. EFFORTS IN SOUTH VIETNAM WEIGHTED WITH UNDEMOCRATIC, UNPOPULAR DIEM FAMILY RULE—WASHINGTON COMMITTED NOT ONLY TO PRESIDENT BUT TO CLIQUE, INCLUDING BROTHER AND BROTHER'S WIFE, THAT FLOUTS ADVICE AND RESISTS CHANGE

(By Richard Dudman)

(Third of a series)

Success or failure of American policy in Vietnam depends heavily on the merits versus the shortcomings of President Ngo Dinh Diem and his family-controlled regime.

The United States helped him to power 8 years ago and now finds itself fully committed, with money, arms, and diplomacy, not only to Diem but also to his brother, his brother's wife, and his other relatives whom he has brought into the small ruling group.

Diem and his nepotarchy are anti-Communist, independent, patriotic, courageous, bright, and apparently quite sincere.

They are also undemocratic, self-righteous, unpopular, cunning, clannish, repressive and inclined to label anyone who criticizes them a Communist or a tool of the Communists.

Radio Hanoi is right when it refers to the "Diem clique," although the use of that phrase is said to have been enough to expel an American correspondent from the country.

The Communist mouthpiece in North Vietnam is wrong, however, when it calls the Diem regime a puppet of the United States.

Diem flouts American advice on military strategy and government policy. His sister-in-law, Mme. Ngo Dinh Nhu, creates a disruptive major issue by prohibiting Americans and everybody else from dancing in South Vietnam and gibes at "that crazy freedom" in the United States.

The family resists American efforts to ease the dictatorial rule, broaden the base of the government and create a more popular and attractive image that will arouse enthusiasm and loyalty among the Vietnamese.

Some of the Americans on the scene with the Communist charge were true and that Diem were a puppet, at least to the extent of taking American advice intended to strengthen his chances of survival.

Diem's aloofness from his people stems partly from his own introspective nature, partly from the fact that he and his family are Roman Catholics in a nation that is 90 percent Buddhist.

He has a good excuse not to risk mingling with his people like a Magsaysay in the Philippines, a Bourguiba in Tunisia or a Sihanouk in Cambodia. Army paratroopers revolted and surrounded the palace in an unsuccessful coup in 1960. Two air force pilots bombed the palace last February in an unsuccessful assassination attempt.

On South Vietnam's independence day last October 26, Diem reviewed a military parade from behind police barricades that kept the general public three blocks from the reviewing stand. No one could enter without security clearance and a special pass.

Later in the day, when he attended mass at the main downtown cathedral in Saigon, his security forces threw a similar cordon around that area.

Diem was asked in a recent interview why he avoided his people. He denied doing so. He said his advisers, on the contrary, reproached him for not being careful enough

as he traveled through the country and mixed with his people.

One of his aids later supplied a map showing that Diem had gone on 62 major inspection tours, aside from public appearances in the Saigon area, and had visited 24 of South Vietnam's 40 provinces one or more times in the previous year.

On independence day, Diem said, the Government had received a tip that grenades might be thrown. As for the reviewing stand, there was not room for the general public without obstructing the view of the marine parade on the river, and then the navy would have protested.

"You can't satisfy everyone," he said.

Diem likes to recall that his struggle for an independent Vietnam began 30 years ago when he resigned as colonial minister of the interior after the French refused to give the legislative assembly real deliberative powers.

But now that he is in control, he is reluctant to permit much self-government. He appoints all the provincial governors, who have both civil functions and military commands. Provincial advisory councils are made up of elected village representatives, but at least half the local elections are rigged.

Rigging has been charged in national elections also, starting with the referendum in 1955, which made Diem chief of state in place of Emperor Bao Dai. The final count gave Diem an implausible 98.2 percent of the votes cast.

The government's leading non-Communist opponent, Phan Quang Dan, was elected to the national assembly in 1959 over government objections, but he was arrested afterward and the election was annulled. The charges were that he had campaigned too early and had made false promises.

Diem's supporters excuse his heavy reliance on his family on the grounds that the young country has few capable persons and that factional fights make it unsafe to trust outsiders.

A result, however, is that many of the educated persons of Saigon are openly hostile to the Diem regime and complain continually of fixed elections and graft by high officials.

Diem is reluctant to talk about the political prisoners held in his reeducation centers. The reason he gives is that too many others might consider the free room and board attractive and demand admittance.

When pressed, he said 8,000 to 9,000 members of dissident political sects were now being reeducated. Other sources, considered reliable, put the current figure at 15,000.

Diem has balked at making budgetary and currency reforms sought by the United States. A dispute over American accounting of foreign aid funds was left moot rather than settled when United States officials gained access to provincial offices where they could see where the money went and no longer needed formal control.

Military advisers are not yet satisfied with intelligence arrangements, but there have been some improvements. The number of competing intelligence organizations has been reduced from about seven to two or three. The advisers now sometimes can see captured documents promptly, but this is often because the Americans are present at the time.

Against American advice, Diem continues to push ahead with his more extreme measures for population control. The United States has withdrawn funds from the "agrovilles," huge collective farms where peasants do forced labor reminiscent of the communes of Red China. American officials also have tried to shelve Operation Sunrise, in which Diem's government uprooted peasants from lands they had held for generations and put them in armed camps for the sake of security and surveillance.

Another disagreement is over the American requirement that aid funds be spent in the United States and that commodities be hauled in American ships.

Diem told the Post-Dispatch an exception should be made for South Vietnam, "so that the increase in aid can be a reality and not just theoretical."

His assistants supplied tables to show that metal products cost from 31 percent to 145 percent more if bought in the United States than if bought in Europe. They said freight charges were often two or three times as much if American ships were used.

Diem argues that Vietnam is at war and on the forefront of the fight against communism and should not be subject to the same rules as other nations receiving American aid.

American officials say the United States did waive the requirements for \$12 million worth of spare parts up to December 1961. It stopped the practice to help reduce the American gold outflow.

They point out that the countries from which South Vietnam wants to buy products are also potential aid contributors and should be doing their part to help. They mention Japan and France particularly.

Instead of asking the United States to relax its rules, these officials say, South Vietnam should bring pressure on these other anti-Communist countries to extend grants or credits.

Officials note also that South Vietnam has some foreign exchange of its own and could earn more if it stimulated rice exports, instead of penalizing them as it now does under its multiple exchange rate system. They say it could earn \$40 million a year by exporting rice.

For all his difficulties, Diem speaks as if things are going well with the campaign against the Communist-led Vietcong. He estimates that it will take 3 more years, at the present rate, to establish "complete security" in his country.

Diem's restraint and politeness contrast sharply with the outbursts of his sister-in-law, Mme. Ngo Dinh Nhu. Some Americans suspect it is by prearrangement that he speaks in conciliatory tones while she sounds off against American policies and institutions.

She has been promoting her ban on dancing with all the fervor of a Carry Nation, especially where Americans are involved.

Lecturing a U.S. Army audience in the swampy Mekong Delta, she said: "The Americans came here not for dancing but to help us, and they should share our austerity and our way of life. Here in Vietnam we dance only with death."

An experienced American observer believes she has begun to exhibit an almost pathological hostility and hatred for Americans.

Mme. Nhu told the Post-Dispatch she thought there would be no problem of American compliance with the morality law.

"For the minority who really prefer to abandon this front to go to prostitutes or to dance, we shall not miss them and will 'invite them out' of this country with pleasure," she said.

She created another controversial issue by pushing through the National Assembly her "code of the family," a law prohibiting divorce except by Presidential decree and making adultery a prison offense.

She says she meets the press only as a duty, but when duty calls she seems to enjoy lashing back at American criticisms. In a recent interview she said the American press was infiltrated with Communists and referred to "that crazy freedom in your country, where the press refuses any organization of self-censorship."

Asked by the Post-Dispatch to explain what she meant by "that crazy freedom" in America, she said she referred to "freedom

which hurts and harms, which goes loose and gets lost."

"I would not trust anything unless it had a careful and well-organized system of filtering and self-control, just to make sure that the liberty they want to enjoy is not exploited and turned against the great majority," she said. "I do not have the impression that there is any self-control organization in American information media, for example, to protect it against infiltration."

Mme. Nhu's feminist campaigns may sound trivial, and they arouse much criticism, but they appeal strongly to many Vietnamese women, who take her women's solidarity movement seriously. Criticism and ridicule come mainly from the men.

Some observers believe she already exerts powerful influence by using her women's organization as a political and intelligence network.

She denies she has any real power in the government, but then she goes on to tell anecdotes that prove she is a key figure.

When Laos was neutralized last year, the Diem government was displeased but at American request refrained from saying so. But Mme. Nhu, in West Berlin at the time, told a press conference the Laotian compromise was a cowardly solution that prepared Laos for legal conquest by the Communists.

She said Diem complained about her remark, but she told him she could not be telephoning him every 5 minutes when she was halfway around the world.

"I said I would ask his advice when I was in this country if it was possible," she said. "But I don't know where he is every minute, and so far I have never asked."

On her return from Europe, she repeated and amplified her view that the United States compromise in Laos was a cowardly mistake.

When rumors connected her with a lottery racket in Saigon, she summoned the minister of the interior and told him to stop the rumors and the racket. He said he could not.

"I know that I am not behind this racket," she said she told him. "Inasmuch as you are permitting it to continue, I can believe only that you are behind it."

The intimidated official took prompt steps.

Another official told her he could not very well sew up people's mouths to stop them from spreading rumors connecting her with a shipping scandal.

"I ordered his security file checked 10 times a day, just to be sure it was not he that was behind the shipping scandal," she said. "He soon found he could stop the rumors."

She related also how she had urged Diem to make a public demand that the United States give South Vietnam a bigger radio transmitter so that his broadcasts would reach more of his people.

"But he said he couldn't bring public pressure on the United States—he didn't want to become a Sihanouk," she recalled.

If the Diem family hates anyone more than the Communists, it is Prince Norodom Sihanouk in neighboring Cambodia. The two countries have been feuding for hundreds of years.

In one of the arguments between Mme. Nhu and President Diem, she recalls telling him: "I'm not a child. I'm an adult. You're neither my father nor my husband."

Mme. Nhu's husband, Ngo Dinh Nhu, is Diem's youngest brother. They live in the palace, where Nhu has his office as political counselor to the President. He also operates an elite political party, the 70,000-member Can Lao, which serves as a secret espionage network for the Diem family.

Nhu is the chief theoretician of the campaign against the Vietcong. He led in adapting the strategic hamlet program to South Vietnam. He sees it as a cooperative system that can mobilize the forces of all the

underdeveloped countries to raise standards of living and defeat Communist subversion throughout the world.

Nhu says he has to resist government pressure as well as Communist pressure as he tries to make the hamlet program effective.

"Government officials sometimes are afraid of prompt hamlet elections and a truly secret ballot," he told the Post-Dispatch. "They say a really free election might choose inexperienced persons or even a Communist."

"My answer always has been that we have to take that chance. Even if the wrong man is elected, the danger is limited to one hamlet. The advantages of free elections are nationwide."

American officials confirm that Nhu is one of the few in the Diem government who see the strategic hamlet program as a means of creating loyalty to the government rather than as primarily a control apparatus.

"This is a quiet revolution, but a very deep one," he said. "It aims at reversing the guerrilla warfare and subversion that is on the march throughout the world. To win, the government must have a sincere intention to develop democracy."

Nhu also has developed a military strategy which calls for beating the Communists at their own game. He believes that the United States and South Vietnam are both still limited to counter guerrilla warfare—dependent on heavy equipment and elaborate supply lines.

"My main personal effort is to push them to become pure guerrillas, to make them self-sufficient not only materially but also ideologically."

By adopting guerrilla tactics, Nhu believes the Americans and South Vietnamese can lead the Vietcong to concentrate their forces, abandon guerrilla warfare and become dependent on logistical support. They then will be vulnerable to attack by conventional forces.

There have been signs in the last few weeks that Nhu wants to abandon his behind-the-scenes role and become a political figure in his own right. He has begun making well-publicized speeches to classes for strategic hamlet cadres, and he had himself elected president of the Republican Youth Organization, in an unexpected maneuver that required three other candidates to withdraw hastily. Some observers think Diem may be preparing to retire as an elder statesman in favor of Nhu as president.

Two other brothers are also important in the regime. Ngo Dinh Can lives at Hue, up near the 17th parallel, where he controls central Vietnam through his own secret police organization. Ngo Dinh Thuc is archbishop of the new Roman Catholic cathedral in Hue.

Americans who deal with the Diem nepotarchy agree that it practices something approaching absolute rule. They disagree on what to do about this fact.

Efforts at urging reforms have been mainly unsuccessful. The line now appears to be: Don't press the government too hard, don't expect too much, remember that most governments in southeast Asia are dictatorships, and above all keep in mind that no satisfactory substitute is in sight.

A minority view holds that the Diem government faces greater stresses than other regimes in southeast Asia and cannot afford the luxury of dictatorship. This view looks with dismay at the political side of the struggle and questions whether it will be possible at all to win with Diem.

John Kenneth Galbraith, U.S. Ambassador to India, was not referring to Diem, nor was he speaking for the administration, when he wrote recently about dictatorship, but his comment applies in Vietnam:

"We must not excuse dictatorship on grounds of anticommunism or convenience

or the absence of visible alternatives. This is one of the oldest habits, and is certainly the most myopic, of our foreign policy. Its price, as we have now painfully learned, is disaster magnified by postponement."

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Feb. 6, 1963]

ASIA'S FRONTIERS OF FREEDOM—POLITICAL REACTION A PROBLEM IN THE USE OF DIRTY TACTICS TO FIGHT VIETCONG GUERRILLAS—MILITARY ADVANTAGE OF POISONING CROPS, FIRE BOMBING VILLAGES WEIGHED AGAINST OPPOSITION TO GOVERNMENT SUCH TECHNIQUES AROUSE

(By Richard Dudman)

(Fourth of a series)

Dirty-war tactics being used by the United States and its Vietnamese allies in Southeast Asia pose a dilemma for American policymakers.

The dilemma, clearly recognized but not yet resolved, is how to use the dirty tactics effectively without turning the Vietnamese people against their Government.

Take, for example, Operation Ranch Hand, a system of spraying the land with poison to kill plants that provide the Communist-led guerrillas with food and shelter.

Officials hope it can be effective in helping starve out and flush out the enemy Vietcong. Details are secret, but it is known that converted U.S. Air Force planes sweep across the countryside spraying poison from nozzles along their wings to destroy rice fields around insurgent strongholds and to strip the brush from roadsides where the enemy sometimes hides in ambush.

For technical reasons, the defoliant sprays have not worked very well yet. Correct mixtures and concentrations have not been learned. A plan to burn a path 1 mile wide along the Cambodian border, to keep the enemy from taking refuge in neutral territory, is still on the drawing board.

A troubling question is whether the use of poisonous sprays is a valid technique of warfare. That is, will the military results be offset by political disadvantages, by resentment over the destruction of food?

The same dilemma arises over the use of strafing, bombs, rockets, and napalm to destroy peasant villages where guerrilla bands have indicated the presence of guerrilla bands.

American flyers seek to justify these attacks by saying that villages deserve retaliation if they give shelter to the enemy. They say there can be no such thing as an innocent bystander in a war that depends ultimately on whether the peasants support the enemy or the Government.

Officials who are carrying on the counterinsurgency campaign give the more sophisticated argument that terror must be met with terror. They say the peasants must be taught that if they give in to the terror of the Vietcong, supplying food, recruits, and information, the punishment from the Government side will be even worse than the Vietcong can impose.

At the same time, this harsh tactic can be interpreted as proving that the fighting in Vietnam is a war by the Vietnamese Government, with American help, against the Vietnamese people.

Similarly, a strict system of population control, proposed by American officials and now being enforced on a pilot basis in Phu Yen Province, has some military justification but also some serious political drawbacks.

After the Post-Dispatch reported details of this plan last October, officials scrapped the original Agency for International Development booklet describing it, had it rewritten to take out objectionable passages, and considered giving the revised version a security classification to keep it from public knowledge.

The plan itself remains unchanged in its essentials. It calls for sweeping restrictions

on the movement of persons, food and supplies in an effort to starve out the Viet Cong and separate it from its sources of food, supplies, information and recruits.

Features of the plan include fixed check points, where vehicles and persons are searched by armed inspectors; emergency check points to conduct surprise searches; elaborate accounting of all commodity shipments, and predawn searches of peasant huts or entire villages.

The original plan was published in a booklet titled "Control of Population and Material Movement" by E. H. Adkins Jr., a former Federal Bureau of Investigation agent who now is assigned by AID as public safety adviser to the Vietnamese Government. He adapted it from a system used by the British in suppressing Communist-led insurgents in Malaya in the 1940's and 1950's.

Adkins' outline of the control system aroused bitter disagreement among American officials. One called it insane and said it would only alienate the Vietnamese people.

Some complained that the plan called for police-state methods reminiscent of the Gestapo. They objected particularly to the statement that "arrests, wherever possible, should be made in the early hours of the morning to insure the element of surprise."

Another part of the plan said a check point should be equipped with two machine guns, two shotguns, two carbines and pistols. It said one man should always have a weapon at the ready when a vehicle was halted. The driver should be ordered to "stand facing the vehicle with his hands on the roof or side of the car" while an inspector searched "under the arms, the stomach, inside the thighs and the crotch." Persons halted in this way were to be searched first and questioned afterward.

Advantages and disadvantages of the Adkins plan were described in an introduction by Frank J. Walton, chief of the public safety division of the U.S. operations mission, the AID field office in Saigon.

He described the control of food, medicine, and clothing as a "vital factor in the war against subversion and guerrilla activities" and said such controls in Malaya "were a major factor in starving out, tracing, locating, and bringing to justice the insurgents."

Walton went on to say that the controls would be "extremely bothersome and time-consuming to good citizens." Therefore, he urged a public relations program to explain the need for the program and to tell how it would work. He said the Vietnamese authorities should be trained in "courteous, but firm, handling of the general public."

Officials who objected to passages in the book also found fault with the phrase "population control" and said the American part in the plan should be concealed. They also obtained oral assurances that inspectors would search travelers at gunpoint and force them to lean against the sides of their vehicles only in extreme cases.

AID officials persuaded the Vietnamese to adopt the plan by linking it to the counterinsurgency and strategic hamlet programs.

"The minute you say something is connected with counterinsurgency or strategic hamlets, they go for it right away," an official explained.

Other techniques that have been considered as part of the insurgency campaign are a portable one-man radar, portable heat-sensitive cells to detect hidden Viet Cong, and the use of police dogs to help track down the enemy.

The idea of using dogs was dropped after it was found each animal's canned horsemeat was costing \$1.20 a day—three times the pay of a Vietnamese soldier.

Strategic hamlets are at the heart of the campaign against the insurgents. With American help, the Government is working

to cover the country with a network of fenced settlements similar to the stockade of American colonial days or the kibbutzim in Israel.

Protection is one feature. An armed civil guard patrols the perimeter at night, and American radios are used if necessary to call for help from other hamlets or regional army units. Armed guards watch over the peasants when they go out to work their rice paddies.

Separation is another feature. Screened peasants are required to live inside the fence. Each family must keep a census book and will soon have to keep its own group photograph; if a member of the family is absent he is presumed to have run off to join or help the Vietcong.

As the hamlets spread across the country, so the theory goes, the Vietcong will be confined to poorer sections and forced to raid the hamlets to seize food and supplies. This is supposed to make the guerrillas the enemies of the people and frustrate their efforts to pose as the friends and saviors of the people.

There are technical difficulties in Vietnam that make it hard to apply the techniques pioneered by the British in Malaya.

In Malaya, the guerrillas were Chinese squatters, easy to distinguish from the Malay population. In Vietnam, the guerrillas are Vietnamese and can vanish into the general population.

Finally, Malaya has a rubber economy and a food deficit. Starving out the enemy was a practical possibility. Vietnam, however, has a food surplus, and food is grown in most parts of the country. Living off the land is relatively easy for the Viet Cong.

Malaya has no common boundary with a Communist country, whereas cadres, weapons and supplies can be carried into South Vietnam from the north across wild unmarked boundaries, and on coastwise junks.

A more fundamental difficulty in Vietnam is a difference in point of view between the government of Ngo Dinh Diem and the top American advisers on counterinsurgency.

The Vietnamese Government tends to take a limited and mechanical view of the population living and building schools, clinics, and waterworks.

The Vietnamese Government races so fast to build spiked fences, set up new strategic hamlets and control more and more of the population that AID officials cannot keep up with the accompanying tasks of digging wells and providing schooling and medical help.

Americans and Vietnamese disagree also over some sort of amnesty program, opening the way for insurgents to defect and become loyal citizens. The Vietnamese regime tends toward the view that once an enemy always an enemy. It's reeducation centers are more like concentration camps than places for rehabilitation.

This problem involves around 300,000 South Vietnamese. Estimates of the number who are armed regulars range from 20,000 to 30,000. The others support the national liberation front, the Communist-led political apparatus in South Vietnam, to the extent that they are willing to take personal risks in its behalf.

It is this group from which the Vietcong draws its recruits and gets supplies of food, clothing, and intelligence.

As the military phase of the war progresses, there remains the political phase in which these 300,000 must be wooed back into the society.

There is reason to fear that the Diem regime may give no way out to these Vietnamese who have been coaxed or coerced into the insurgent movement. Even worse would be a fraudulent amnesty, persuading insurgents to give themselves up and then invoking harsh punishment and offering no chance of rehabilitation.

Another way of saying all this is that winning the military war is hard enough, but that even while winning the military war we could lose the political war.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch Feb. 7, 1963]

ASIA'S FRONTIERS OF FREEDOM—U.S. POLICY-MAKERS HAVING TROUBLE IN SUPPORTING BOTH ASIAN ALLIES AND NEUTRALISTS—CURRENT EFFORTS SATISFYING NEITHER—SEATO DIVISIVE, INEFFECTIVE AGAINST SUBVERSION—HAS PUSHED SOME NONALIGNED NATIONS TOWARD REDS

(By Richard Dudman)

(Fifth of a series)

One of the American dilemmas in Southeast Asia is how to deal with the neutralists.

The problem is how to help the uncommitted neighbors of the countries whose governments have sided with the West against the Chinese-Soviet bloc—in short, how to aid the non-Communists without breaking faith with the anti-Communists.

The Kennedy administration indicates by its actions that it has not settled on a firm policy.

On the one hand, it actively seeks friendship with the neutrals. It helped add to their ranks, in fact, when it backed a neutralist compromise last year to end the civil war in Laos.

W. Averell Harriman, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, said recently that the Kennedy administration had adopted a policy somewhat different from that of its predecessor.

Recalling that Burma, Cambodia, and Malaya had been successful in stemming Communist subversion in their countries, Harriman said the administration believed that it was "adequate for a government to be non-Communist (as distinct from anti-Communist) in order for the positive power of its nationalism to preserve its independence and resist subversion."

On the other hand, the administration has continued to support the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, one of the alliances the late John Foster Dulles devised to unite the pro-Western nations and set them apart from the neutrals, whose position he considered immoral.

SEATO has been ineffective against Communist subversion and, worse, has been a divisive force in southeast Asia. It has isolated its own members from the rest of Asia and has pushed some nonaligned countries toward the Communist bloc.

The administration has given only a cool reception, moreover, to Cambodia's request for joint East-West protection of its neutrality and territorial integrity along the lines of the agreement covering Laos.

As usual in such cases, the current American policy satisfies no one. The neutrals believe they are receiving second-class treatment. Some of the Western-allied regimes, notably those in Vietnam and Thailand, believe that the United States is rewarding softness toward communism at the expense of the dedicated anti-Communists.

Neutralist sentiment is strong throughout southeast Asia, even in the countries now considered pro-Western. Its sources are centuries of civil war and conquest, generations of colonial rule, devastation, and Japanese occupation in World War II, and, above all, their proximity to China.

The aggressive expansionism of China is not just a Communist phenomenon; it dates back more than 1,000 years. Tribes from China's border regions overrun southeast Asia repeatedly. Their descendants now populate much of Burma, Thailand, Laos, and Vietnam.

The rich rice bowl of the Indochinese peninsula always has been a powerful magnet attracting the rulers of China, with its chronic hunger.

Cambodians and Burmese like to point out that they have had little or no trouble with Communist China, whereas the countries that sided with the West, such as South Vietnam, Thailand, and Laos, when it was under its short-lived rightist regimes, had serious problems of Communist insurgency.

There is some basis for this assertion just now, although the Cambodians and Burmese have had to use harsh police measures to suppress their Communist undergrounds. Continued Communist insurgency in Burma was one reason given for a military coup last year that set up the present dictatorship under General Ne Win.

Burma claims an additional benefit from its neutralism. In 1960 Peking abruptly agreed to compromise its claim to a large part of northern Burma. It signed a border agreement, gave Burma an \$84 million interest-free loan and promised to buy 350,000 tons of Burmese rice at a premium price.

It seemed not to matter that this conciliatory attitude by the Chinese turned out to be a prelude to tough action along China's frontier with India. Burma still considers the transaction to its advantage.

The Chinese attacks along the Himalayan border last October and November have not spelled out the same lesson to the neutralists of Southeast Asia that they did to the State Department. The American hope and expectation was that these neutralists would see the light and realize that co-existence is an illusion and that Chinese promises cannot be trusted.

Burmese and Cambodian leaders seem to conclude, on the contrary, that India's problem was in not being neutral enough. They profess also to see two sides to the India-China border dispute and to believe it could have been compromised in 1959 and should be compromised now.

A Burmese official recalled a conversation with a Communist-bloc diplomat about the China-India fighting.

"Who is in the right?" the Communist asked.

"I have read the claims by both sides and find them both convincing," the Burmese replied.

"Which did you read more recently?" the Communist asked.

"I read them both at the same time," said the Burmese.

A basic fact in southeast Asia is that most of the people and many of their governments do not regard Communist China as their overriding hazard. They do not share the belief of Chiang Kai-shek and the State Department that the aggressiveness and even the existence of the Communist regime are by far the worst threat to the area.

This fact accounts for the failure of SEATO as well as for the difficulties of American policy generally in southeast Asia.

Laos, the newest of the neutrals, has really never been anything else. American agreement to support a neutral coalition government merely marked the end of an abortive American effort to turn Laos into a bastion of anticommunism.

Through most of the Eisenhower administration, the State Department and the Central Intelligence Agency fought to prevent the very compromise solution that the United States now hopes will succeed.

They tried to block the Geneva accords of 1954, which left Laos a neutral buffer between Thailand and north Vietnam. Through American aid, they built up a huge rightist army intent on suppressing the insurgent Pathet Lao rather than integrating it into Laotian political life.

Twice in 5 years, American agents and dollars were used to help back rightist coups that overthrew neutralist coalitions headed by Prince Souvanna Phouma—the same man on whom the United States now bases its hope for an independent neutralist regime.

The upshot of these American efforts in Laos was to push Souvanna Phouma's neutralists into an alliance with the Pathet Lao and to bring about Soviet intervention in Laos, not as a case of clear-cut aggression but in response to an American-supported effort to overthrow a neutralist government there.

The end came when the huge army of the American-backed Gen. Phoumi Nosavan fled across the Mekong River into Thailand before a limited Pathet Lao attack at Nam Tha.

Considering that background, the new troika-style government with Souvanna Phouma as Premier and Defense Minister, is progressing somewhat better than had been expected. Prince Souphanouvong, the Red Prince, vice premier and minister of economic planning, is a nationalist as well as a Communist and pays at least lipservice to the objective of making the coalition work.

Phoumi Nosavan, as vice premier and minister of finance, ironically, has been the one to visit Moscow, Peking and Hanoi, returning with promises of economic aid and an attitude described by an acquaintance as euphoric.

The major immediate problem is to unify the armed forces and end the present de facto partition of the country. The 3 factions have agreed to do this, by cutting back the 70,000 rightists, 19,000 Pathet Lao and 12,000 neutralists to 10,000 each. The agreement has yet to be carried out.

The Premier is beginning to achieve the power to move freely through the country. Freedom of movement, by government officials and a unified army, can enforce neutrality in a manner impossible for the three-nation International Control Commission formally charged with that task.

Several thousand Vietminh Communist troops from North Vietnam are said to remain in the country, but they are believed to be staying inactive rather than safeguarding infiltration routes through Laos to South Vietnam.

Cambodia enjoys internal security under a popular ruler, Prince Norodom Sihanouk. He mingles freely with his people and inspires enthusiastic patriotism, unlike the aloof President Ngo Dinh Diem in South Vietnam, Marshal Sarit Thanarat in Thailand and Gen. Ne Win in Burma.

Cambodia's big fear is invasion by Thailand and South Vietnam. They have been encroaching on Cambodian territory from time to time over the last five centuries, and their leaders have been threatening lately to divide Cambodia between them.

Sihanouk, for his part, upsets the State Department and his Asian neighbors by voicing his own version of the "better Red than dead" position. He says he would rather see Cambodia as a satellite of Communist China than to see it destroyed by Thailand or Vietnam.

Under these circumstances, Cambodia takes no sides in the war in Vietnam. It would, indeed, hate to see the country unified under any leadership, for fear the united armies would be turned against Cambodia.

Cambodia gets 40-percent American support for its 30,000-man army (compared to 200,000 regulars in South Vietnam and 80,000 in Thailand) and recently received 16 American fighter planes. It wants more military aid, either from the West or from the Communists, unless it can have some new political protection against its two neighbors.

Its formal proposal, circulated privately in early December, went to the other 13 nations that took part in the Laos conference. It calls for assurances rather than a guarantee, as Cambodia first proposed and omits the idea of another Geneva conference. It would require signers to send troops if necessary to protect Cambodia against invasion.

This goes considerably further than the Laos pact, which calls merely for consultation.

Communist China said it was prepared to sign immediately. The Soviet Union and France also approved the proposal. The United States, Britain and India so far have withheld substantive comment.

The State Department has been cool to the whole idea because of the strong objections of South Vietnam and Thailand, which insist that they fear aggression from Cambodia. The Department opposed a conference for fear it might be extended to a discussion of some neutralist solution for the war in Vietnam.

Meanwhile, Sihanouk continues to accept economic aid from the United States, the Soviet Union and Red China and to lead his palace volleyball team to victory over the Americans of the Military Assistance Advisory Group, a diplomatic corps team that is mainly Communist and the other groups that take part in his nonaligned athletic league.

Watching a game recently, Sihanouk smiled as he noticed the Indian ambassador sitting on the sidelines with the Soviet ambassador on one side of him and the U.S. Ambassador, Philip D. Sproule, on the other. "Volleyball is good for friendship and good for health—a good combination," said the prince.

Relations with Cambodia have been impaired by a tendency of some American publications to ridicule the prince by charges in South Vietnam that Cambodia offers privileged sanctuary and an infiltration route for the insurgent Vietcong.

American military observers in Laos and Vietnam deny those charges.

Unlike Cambodia, which tries to be friendly with all the big powers, Burma gives the impression that it distrusts them all.

U.S. Ambassador John S. Everton has seen General Ne Win only three times since last March—when he presented his credentials, when Ne Win protested against a flight by an American plane, and when Everton introduced Senator Mike Mansfield on a visit to Burma.

The Burmese dictator seems to be keeping a tally of his diplomatic appointments with the United States, China, and the Soviet Union and holding them equal.

Burmese distrust of the United States results partly from 10 years of insurgent activity by units of Chiang Kai-shek's Chinese Nationalist Army. The forces were supplied from Formosa by planes flown by former U.S. Air Force pilots.

A captured Nationalist document said the insurgent group was to make trouble between Communist China and Burma with a view to bringing the United States into war against the Peking regime.

The Burmese put these pieces together and concluded that the United States could stop the raids if it wanted to. The Eisenhower administration eventually evacuated some of the Nationalist forces and withdrew American support for those remaining in Burma. After a new flareup, the Kennedy administration airlifted more of the Chinese Nationalist troops out of Burma in 1961.

That prompt action eased the situation, but resentment lingers. Last year Ne Win ordered the Ford and Asia Foundations and the Fulbright educational exchange program to get out of Burma.

The year-old dictatorship has stated its policy in a manifesto, "The Burmese Way to Socialism." The document says the regime will build a Socialist state using indigenous Burmese methods.

It firmly renounces parliamentary democracy which, it says, "has not only failed to serve our social development, but also, due to its very defects, weaknesses and loopholes, its abuses and the absence of a mature public opinion, lost sight of and deviated from the socialist aims."

Ne Win files about the country continually on missions announced only later. He is working to build up the Burmese economy, partly by its own efforts and partly through economic aid from East and West. He is suppressing gambling and superstition and reforming the educational system to support socialist development.

He avoids contact with his people. When he plays golf, soldiers with machineguns surround the course.

In keeping with his disdain for parliamentary democracy, his government turned submachineguns on demonstrating students at Rangoon University last July. The controlled press said the students first were warned 3 times to disperse and then 15 were killed and 40 wounded.

Students told the Post-Dispatch there was no warning. They said 45 were killed and 100 were wounded.

The next morning, Ne Win's troops returned and dynamited the 34-year-old Student Union Building, cleared away the rubble and left the site vacant. An official statement said the institution had become a haven for underground leaders plotting overthrow of the government.

Ne Win, in one of his rare public speeches, blamed certain political organizations for the incident and promised to "meet sword with sword and spear with spear."

There had been some student resistance to plans to create a new single political party. A draft constitution had been published a few days earlier.

But the students said the point of their demonstration was merely to have the supper hour changed from 6 p.m. to 4 p.m. and to obtain permission to stay out of their dormitories until 11 p.m., instead of 8 p.m.

A statement last November by U Sun Tun, dean of students of the university, indicated the intellectual atmosphere of the place under the Ne Win regime. He banned political discussions of any kind on the university campus "to keep the student body from falling prey to scheming politicians as in the past."

The dean said he had halted a discussion of the Berlin and Cuba situations in a meeting that was addressed by a leftist leader, since Burma's neutrality requires it to avoid taking sides in the cold war.

"We cannot allow our students to be biased one way or the other in controversial political issues and the best way to safeguard them from this danger is to ban political discussions on the university campus," he said.

[From the St. Louis Post Dispatch, Feb. 8, 1963]

ASIA'S FRONTIERS OF FREEDOM—POLITICAL USE OF MILITARY POWER RATHER THAN COMBAT IS INVOLVED IN TECHNIQUE BEING TRIED BY UNITED STATES—FEATURED BY CONCENTRATION OF ARMAMENTS AND STRATEGIC MOVEMENT OF TROOPS—LONG-TERM PROGRAM NEEDED FOR SELF-DETERMINATION

(By Richard Dudman)

(Sixth of a series)

A field full of "mothballed" American military equipment in northern Thailand is a reminder that the 4,000 combat troops stationed there for 6 months last year could return on 15 hours' notice.

The field, outside the city of Korat, contains tanks, howitzers, armored cars, heavy trucks, and stocks of structural steel that can be assembled into military bridges.

Nearby are rows of simple but comfortable barracks, wooden floors and frames with screened sides, and thatched awnings that can be let down for protection against the driving monsoon rains. The wood is teak, which lasts a lifetime.

These items are part of the hardware for a new style of warfare being developed by the

United States, a style that often involves no fighting, so it is hoped.

Southeast Asia is its chief laboratory, the testing ground for new techniques being devised to deal with the threats and blandishments, the political agitation, the subversion, and the guerrilla fighting that characterize the struggle between the Communist bloc and the American-led Western bloc.

For want of a better phrase, the new American techniques are sometimes lumped together by Washington policymakers as the political use of military power.

Some of the techniques are well known. The troop airlift from Hawaii to Thailand, in fact, was important mainly for its public aspect. It was intended to discourage the Communist-led Pathet Lao from taking over the rest of Laos, to reassure Thailand that the United States stood ready to protect it, and to show the world that the United States was determined that the Lao compromise of 1961 would stick and that the country would in fact become a neutralist buffer state.

The strategy seemed to work. The Pathet Lao advance stopped. The three Laotian princes resumed their stalled negotiations and reached an agreement on a coalition government.

Administration officials claim similar success for an earlier show of force in the same area. They say the Russians and the Chinese were willing to meet at Geneva in 1961 and negotiate for a neutralist coalition in Laos because U.S. Navy units had steam up in full preparation for military intervention.

Other politico-military techniques are less publicized.

Nothing is said publicly about the "White Star" teams said to have trained tribesmen in the mountains of Laos to fight the Pathet Lao, and to have undertaken other covert missions in other countries.

Their existence is well known in parts of southeast Asia—there was a brothel in Vientiane for a time called the Etoile Blanche—but their organization and functions are secret. It is not clear whether they work for the Defense Department, the Central Intelligence Agency, or some other agency.

Army special forces units operate in the back country of South Vietnam, organizing mountain tribesmen into counter-guerrilla units and working to win the sympathy of the civilian population by providing food, shelter, and medical treatment.

Other specialists work at developing poisonous plants with which to surround strategic hamlets and poisonous sprays to kill underbrush and food crops and deprive enemy guerrillas of hiding places and food supplies.

Still another special technique makes use of the mohlam, a Laotian improvised musical show. American propaganda specialists feed simple pro-Western themes to the mohlam troupes, at the same time keeping the spirit of the earthy folk art form.

A recent problem faced by these psychological warfare specialists was how to persuade the singers to drop a line that ridiculed the "Red Prince," Souphanouvong, questioning his virility in specific terms. Now that he is a member of the neutralist coalition supported by the United States, the line is considered objectionable.

One advantage of these techniques is economy. Conventional warfare, even if it could be effective against an elusive enemy who fights a war that is more political than military, would cost far more.

W. Averell Harriman, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, wrote recently that the decision to aid South Vietnam had the merits of not involving the deployment of American combat forces and not requiring the occupation of foreign territory by U.S. or other Western forces.

"Instead, the North Vietnamese could be engaged by the people of the Republic of

Vietnam, provided they were given technical assistance, training for the defense of their village areas, and increased mobility for their fighting forces," he wrote.

American military action in Laos, on the other hand, Harriman said, would have meant putting large U.S. and SEATO forces into that country, on the border of Communist China, "with unforeseeable consequences in the direction of a major world conflict."

He contended that it would have solved nothing to occupy merely that part of Laos that was in friendly hands.

Some other officials disagreed, believe a moderate-sized American force could have occupied the Lao plains and bottled up the Pathet Lao in the mountains by sealing off five narrow river valleys.

A convenient feature of such techniques, especially troop movements, is that they apply military power without raising the question of a declaration of war, a congressional prerogative under the Constitution.

In the case of sending troops to Thailand, the action had some color of advance congressional approval under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, which had been ratified by the Senate.

This SEATO treaty calls for consultation in case of a threat to the peace of the area, and appropriate action of the members unanimously charge aggression. The unanimity rule was in effect eliminated last year in an agreement between President Kennedy and Thai Premier Sarit Thanarat.

American forces made full use of their 6 months in Thailand to practice operations in rice paddies and jungles in dry and rainy seasons. Their practice marches crisscrossed the country. They subsisted on jungle fruits and parachuted combat rations.

Sometimes the claims of strategic success of such operations turn out to have been exaggerations.

A neutralist source in Laos told the Post-Dispatch the Pathet Lao forces stopped of their own accord last summer, rather than occupy the rest of the country including Vientiane. He said the leftist group did not want the responsibility of feeding the 138,000 inhabitants of the capital.

If that sounds disingenuous, there is more to the story. What the rightists had called a major advance led by 10 Chinese Communist and North Vietnamese battalions turned out to have been only a limited attack. When more facts became known, it appeared that the rightist army had run away and crossed into Thailand without a sign of pursuit.

Moreover, it was in the interests of the Soviet Union in both 1961 and 1962 to halt the fighting in Laos and rely instead on the possibility of an eventual political take-over. Increased fighting would have led to another Korean war. A Communist military victory would have increased Chinese influence in the area at the expense of Soviet influence.

Relations are not always easy with the countries where the United States must carry on this new political warfare. Thailand, for example, was anxious to have the American troops arrive when danger seemed imminent, but it began pressing for their withdrawal when the danger was past.

Thailand, furthermore, became so upset over some increases in military aid to Cambodia last fall that Thai officials began advocating what they called a "Thai-list" policy that was never fully explained but seemed to hint at a swing toward neutralism.

Reliance on supposedly strongly anti-Communist regimes has had its hazards. In Iraq, a revolution overthrew the government of Nuri Said, and guns that had been supplied by American military aid were used to bombard his residence.

More recently, Pakistan showed its anger over American military aid to India by firing

a propaganda barrage and signing a treaty with Communist China.

A fundamental difficulty with the new techniques of political warfare is simply that they are no more than techniques.

Used pragmatically, to combat a particular enemy that has ties with the Communists or to bolster a regime that professes friendship with the West and enmity toward communism, they may have satisfactory short-term effect.

But the future of the long-term struggle in southeast Asia involves historical trends and political forces that have little to do with day-to-day victories and defeats.

Self-determination is a major goal among southeast Asians. In seeking it, they can find much to oppose in both of the world's major power blocs. Communist promises sometimes blind them to communism's actual behavior as a new colonialism. When the West backs unpopular regimes, it recalls Western colonialism and dims current Western professions of freedom.

In South Vietnam, the United States is transplanting the techniques of population movement control that worked for the British, with much effort and a 12-year campaign, in suppressing Communist insurgency in Malaya. What is being overlooked is that victory was assured only when the British granted independence to the federation, thus robbing the Communists of their role as liberators.

Economic progress with an increased standard of living is another important goal among southeast Asians. Here again, Communist theory and Communist leaders promise much. Wherever American aid makes the rich richer, as it often has done in Laos and Vietnam, for example, it supports the Communists' case.

In Latin America, where people have similar overriding hopes, the Kennedy administration has come forth with the Alliance for Progress, which promises generous American help in a cooperative plan for social, political and economic progress and reform.

In southeast Asia, American officials sometimes argue that the threat of communism is too imminent to allow any 10-year plan like the Alliance.

But unless they hold out a positive program that offers hope and self-respect, the best of anti-Communist techniques can fail.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Feb. 10, 1963]

ASIA'S FRONTIERS OF FREEDOM—RED CHINA VERSUS NEUTRAL INDIA—EXTREME VIEWS OF CHINESE AIMS IN BORDER FIGHTING NOW SEEM EXAGGERATED—NEUTRALISM ENCOURAGED BY U.S. AID—MILITANT INDIAN NATIONALISM MAY BE MOST IMPORTANT LONG-TERM RESULT

(By Richard Dudman)
(Seventh of a series)

No one knows for sure what the Chinese Communists had in mind when they attacked India last fall.

Responsible Indians assumed at the time that they faced a major invasion. They said China was trying to seize the oilfields of Assam in the northeast, planning to humiliate India in the eyes of other Asians, or possibly starting to drive to cut India in two with a thrust all the way to Calcutta and the Bay of Bengal.

American officials also were prepared to believe the worst. Some added the suspicion that China wanted to drive a still deeper wedge between India and Pakistan and isolate Pakistan from the Western alliance.

Some of the Americans favored the elaborate speculation that China was arranging a calculated demonstration of the effectiveness of force to contrast with what it called Soviet softness in agreeing to re-

move its missiles and missile bases from Cuba.

Those appraisals were widely believed at the time. No independent check was possible. Indian restrictions prevented reporters or military observers from other countries from getting near the fighting.

The extreme estimates now seem to have been seriously overdrawn. The Chinese have halted and pulled back of their own accord. They have proposed negotiations that would leave the border situation much as it was 4 years ago when the shooting started along the Himalayan frontier.

Indian and American officials were not the best sources of unbiased analysis of the crisis. Both had good reason for deliberate or subconscious exaggeration.

The Indians, proud of their army and confident of their superiority over the Chinese, were profoundly embarrassed by the military defeats and by what they regarded as a stab in the back after years of Chinese lip service to the coexistence pact between the two countries.

A normally soft-spoken Indian official shook with anger as he said, "We will not tolerate this humiliation to our country. We will throw out the Chinese if it takes our last drop of blood."

To American officials, the Chinese attack was final proof of the folly of neutralism and the impossibility of doing business with the Communists. The bigger the invasion, it was thought, the better the lesson would stick.

More specifically, a full-scale Chinese invasion could persuade India to accept American military aid for the first time; at last get rid of Defense Minister V. K. Krishna Menon, the strongest anti-American voice in India, and possibly even modify its policy of nonalignment in the cold war.

A major invasion of India, moreover, might impress Pakistan with the danger of Chinese aggression and persuade that nation to overcome its fear and hatred of India and not raise objections to an American arms airlift to India.

An American official in Saigon may have had some of these points in mind when he talked with a reporter who had just been assigned to the China-India crisis.

"If you see any Chinese, tell them to keep on coming about 200 miles into India," he said.

It was hardly surprising that officials in New Delhi and Washington insisted that the fighting was far more than a border clash and that China was guilty of unprovoked aggression.

Other observers leaned toward a more prosaic explanation. As they saw it, China's objective was simply to maintain a right of way, to secure its hold on a strategic route from its province of Sinkiang into Tibet.

The current trouble spots are two remote areas where the mountains are the highest in the world and even the passes are 15,000 feet or more above sea level.

In both regions, it was neither the Indians nor the Chinese, but the British, who drew on a map the boundary line now in dispute.

One of the areas is northern Ladakh, in India's northwest, originally part of Tibet and still inhabited by people of Tibetan stock. A Sikh ruler conquered it more than 100 years ago and in turn was conquered by the British.

The frontier was not important until the British came. The area was valuable mainly as a trade route to and from China, and the border was where one side stopped collecting taxes and the other side started.

After the British took over, they joined with the Russians in establishing a boundary commission to fix the frontier and also the interests of the two parties. China was weak at the time, especially in its outlying territories of Sinkiang and Tibet, and was left out of the negotiations.

The Indians inherited what they assumed would remain an uninhabited zone so secure it would require no patrolling. The best route through it, after all, had five passes higher than 16,000 feet, and the highest, the Karakoram, was more than 18,000 feet.

But the Chinese achieved the supposedly impossible in 1956 and 1957 and built a road that soon was carrying tanks and guns and 10-ton military trucks into Tibet. The equipment helped China overrun Tibet in 1959. The highway is called the Aksai Chin Road, after the "white desert" that it crosses.

The Indians first learned of the new Chinese road through a map published in a Chinese newspaper. The Indian Government sent out a survey party in 1958, and the Chinese arrested 15 members of the party on charges of trespassing.

The other region in dispute is the northern part of Assam, in northeastern India. When the British moved into Assam in the 1850's, they were interested chiefly in the rich plain of the Brahmaputra River, not in the high mountains and dense jungles of the northern section. They paid subsidies to the hill tribes living there, peoples related to the Tibetans, on condition they would not raid the flatland Assam villages.

Britain saw a chance to draw a permanent boundary north of Assam when an earlier Chinese occupation of Tibet ended with the overthrow of the Manchu dynasty in 1911. The British and the Tibetans drew a line along the crest of a 20,000-foot range and called it the McMahon line. A Chinese envoy initialed the agreement, but his Government repudiated him. No Chinese Government has since recognized the legality of the McMahon line.

The British never occupied this northern territory. They forgot even to show the McMahon line on maps published by the Survey of India.

When the Indians inherited it, however, they began administering it as a closed territory, guarding the tribes against outside influence and trying to raise their living standards. The Chinese continued to claim the area but did nothing about it.

What brought the dispute to a head was India's belated realization that the Chinese had possession of northern Ladakh. The Indians began contesting the Chinese occupation by sending patrols into and building forts in the same area, approaching but not reaching the Aksai Chin Road.

In 1959, the Chinese stated formally their claim to the area in Ladakh and conceded that the disputed area in the northeast, south of the McMahon line, had not been occupied by the Chinese for some time. They offered to settle the border disagreement through negotiations.

This claim and concession, coming together as they did, were interpreted in India as an offer to give up the Chinese claims in the northeast if India would give up northern Ladakh.

India rejected the proposal and continued to press the Chinese in Ladakh. Last September the Chinese retaliated with strong attacks in both the northwest and northeast.

In Ladakh, the Chinese recaptured areas that the Indians had taken in the previous 3 years. In the northeast, technical disagreements over the precise location of the McMahon line made it difficult to say for sure whether the Chinese had pressed south of the unmarked frontier.

Later Chinese advances, in October, went well south of the McMahon line. The Chinese said the advance was retaliation against an Indian offensive intended to drive them back from positions they already had taken.

India had, in fact, announced a new push. It is not clear whether the Chinese reacted to it or anticipated it.

In any event, if it was security of the Aksai Chin road that the Chinese wanted, that is what they have achieved, at least for the present. Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru has offered repeatedly to negotiate if the Chinese will withdraw to their positions of last September 8.

That would put a cease-fire line at the point of farthest Indian advance in Ladakh, but it would mean India's giving up the portion around the Aksai Chin road. It would leave the northeast frontier area in India's hands.

Other results, possibly because most of the world considered the engagement a relatively minor border fracas, did not bear out most of the American expectations.

Neutrals of southeast Asia see both sides of the border dispute and are not inclined to put moral blame on the Chinese. This may be due partly to fear of China and partly to a dislike for India that is widespread in the area.

To the neutralists, the lesson, if anything, is that a nation can remain neutral and still receive help from the United States if co-existence breaks down and the Communists attack.

India has continued to hold firmly to its policy of nonalignment, even though Nehru did at last accept the resignation of his old friend Menon.

India did accept American military aid, but only reluctantly and with a minimum of publicity. Indian newspapers were instructed by telegram to publish only brief accounts of the airlift and to omit photographs.

They obeyed almost without exception but complained that Radio Moscow and Radio Peking carried more news of the American military aid than appeared in the India press.

American arms, which arrived by airlift every 3 hours around the clock, disappeared behind a wall of Indian secrecy. United States and Indian crews unloaded from 20 to 24 tons of cargo from each plane, and trucks or Indian transport planes took the materiel away without further accountability.

One of the reasons Americans desired more publicity on the aid was to reassure Pakistan. The Pakistan press was complaining that the American arms would actually be used to strengthen India's position against Pakistan.

Pakistan's fear and hatred of India remains undiminished today.

In the longer term, China has brought about another result that could prove far more important than merely holding control of a road to Tibet.

The Chinese attack, whatever the rights and wrongs, aroused India to a pitch of militant nationalism unmatched in that nation's 15 years of independence.

At the time of the fighting, Indian students held almost daily demonstrations, marching, shouting slogans, giving blood, and often throwing rocks at the Chinese Embassy and burning effigies of Chou En-lai.

Indians of all classes now stop a visiting American on the street to condemn Chinese treachery and praise American friendship and help in time of need.

Indian businessmen sent out Christmas cards that were color photographs of flag-decked Indian tanks. On the inside, they said, "Season's greetings and all good wishes for a bright and prosperous New Year."

This new Indian unity and determination could be decisive in the continuing rivalry with China for influence among the developing nations of the continent.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Feb. 11, 1963]

ASIA'S FRONTIERS OF FREEDOM—BICKERING BETWEEN NATIONS COMPLICATES FIGHT AGAINST REDS IN SOUTHEASTERN ASIA—SOME OF THE COUNTRIES HATE EACH OTHER MORE THAN THEY HATE COMMUNISTS—EVEN AMERICAN OFFICIALS FIND THEMSELVES TAKING SIDES IN DISPUTES

(By Richard Dudman)

(Eighth of a series)

A dispute over a centuries-old border temple has been a major public issue for the last few years in Cambodia and Thailand.

The controversy, legally concluded by the World Court last June but still rankling in both countries, is one of the many local quarrels that complicate the cold war.

Some of them, including the disagreement over the temple, are bigger public issues than the threat of Communist aggression in the countries involved.

These local disputes are not limited to any one part of the world, of course. India and Pakistan have fought bitterly in the past and are ready to fight again over the Kashmir. Hostilities between the Arab States and Israel plague the Middle East. Ecuador and Peru struggle over ownership of the headwaters of the Amazon.

In southeast Asia, the most serious current quarrels are between Cambodia and Thailand and between Cambodia and Vietnam.

The three countries are among the strong, expansionist states that developed on the southeast Asian peninsula about 1,000 years ago, after an earlier millennium in which tribes from the border regions of China had pushed southward and populated much of the area.

Burma invaded Thailand several times in a dispute that lasted four centuries and ended only with British colonization in the 1800's.

Thailand conquered several northern Malayan States, invaded the Khmer (Cambodian) empire and struggled with Vietnam for influence in Laos. The Vietnamese pushed southward and forced the Khmers out of Cochinchina, now the southernmost part of Vietnam.

Colonialism brought a suspension of these regional rivalries. The pause lasted until World War II when Japanese occupation marked the end of colonialism in the area. Nationalism had been growing and the rivalries burst forth again after the nations gained independence.

Thailand, having grabbed two Cambodian provinces and part of Laos with Japanese help in World War II, was forced to give them back in 1947, but still wants them. Cambodia continues to claim Cochinchina, which is inhabited by some 400,000 Cambodians.

Cambodian leaders charge that both Thailand and South Vietnam have designs on their country. They say, with apparent conviction, that they believe their two neighbors want to split Cambodia at the Mekong River and divide its territory between them.

Each of these nations is proud of a long and glorious history. Their politicians paint pictures of a golden age that was destroyed by colonialism.

It matters little that these histories have only a fragmentary basis, mainly the work of European scholars who removed jungle growth from ancient temples and cities and pieced together series of civilizations that were all but forgotten.

Recent discoveries reinforced dim recollections and the result was a strong sense of history that makes even minor border disputes become issues of national honor and prestige.

So it has been with the trouble over the temple of Preah Vihear. The holy place was founded in the 10th century, but it was neither well known nor particularly important until the Thai occupied it in 1953 and the Cambodians began issuing a series of protests.

Some Thai scoffed that it was not even Buddhist, but Brahman.

By the time the controversy was handed to the World Court in 1959 it had become a fighting matter. Thailand massed troops on the frontier and there was a demonstration in front of the Cambodian Embassy in Saigon.

Thailand stole a march by retaining as its counsel Philip C. Jessup, an international law expert who has held important State Department assignments. Cambodia responded, to the Thai chagrin, by retaining former Secretary of State Dean Acheson.

When Jessup later was named a judge of the World Court, some Thai thought they saw a dark plot. They thought the United States had decided to fix the case in Cambodia's favor in one move by taking away Thailand's lawyer and bribing him with an appointment to the Court.

The Thai, nevertheless, became confident they would win. On the day of their final argument, three elephants were seen walking together in Thailand and the sun broke through the clouds at The Hague. These were considered good omens.

When the Court found in favor of Cambodia, the news was a profound shock to Thailand. There were more riots in front of the Cambodian Embassy, encouraged or at least permitted by the Thai Government.

Hard feeling continued even after Thailand agreed reluctantly 3 weeks later to abide by the Court's decision. Officials in Bangkok speculated that Prince Sihanouk of Cambodia would not be able to visit the shrine from the Cambodian side, because the only access was up some broken steps on the face of a cliff. One of the steps was said to be 9 feet high.

There was speculation that Sihanouk would go to his temple by helicopter. There were Thai threats to shoot any Cambodians who dared set foot on Thai soil.

Sihanouk eventually visited the temple without serious incident, but the exchanges of threats continue.

One of the more colorful attacks on Cambodia was an editorial blast in a Bangkok newspaper. The paper recalled that several hundred years ago a Thai king had cut off the head (the highest, most sacred part of the body) of a Cambodian king and had used the blood to wash his feet (the lowest, most profane part of the body). The paper said the Thai were ready to do the same thing again.

For a time in 1960 the two countries had an agreement not to threaten or insult each other, but the truce broke down in a series of bitter exchanges that culminated in what the Cambodians considered an intolerable insult.

Sihanouk had stopped off in Tokyo and had been interviewed by the Japanese press. He was asked whether he was worried about Communist activities in Laos. He replied that he was not worried as much about the Communists as he was by the threats of Thailand and Vietnam against Cambodia.

Through a misunderstanding or poor translation, Marshal Sarit Thanarat, Thailand's premier, took the remark as a threat against Thailand.

He promptly issued a statement saying that "for Prince Sihanouk to threaten Thailand is like a pig threatening a lion."

Sihanouk suspended diplomatic relations.

When the United States blockaded Cuba and threatened invasion, many Thai concluded that meant it would be all right for Thailand to do the same to Cambodia.

Cambodia's relations with Vietnam have been just as bad. Both sides have charged repeatedly that the other side sent armed raiding parties across the border.

Newspapers of both countries carry frequent accounts of water buffalo rustlers slipping across the border and driving the cattle off to the other side.

The South Vietnamese have made the serious charge that Cambodian territory is being used as a sanctuary by Vietcong forces, as the Communist-led guerrillas flee from Vietnamese army attacks. They have charged also that North Vietnam sends arms and reinforcements through Cambodian territory into South Vietnam.

It is generally agreed that there are some minor incursions of the wild, unmarked border. But investigations of the border area have failed to disclose any Vietcong bases or organized infiltration traffic on Cambodian territory.

These bitter local controversies are facts of life in southeast Asia, as in other parts of the world. They raise the question of what responsibility the United States has for military assistance it gives countries in the area. Must the United States guarantee that Cambodia will not use its American arms to threaten Thailand and South Vietnam, or that Thailand and South Vietnam will not use their American arms against Cambodia?

A related question is how to keep American officials from taking sides in the disputes. Some of the diplomatic and aid officials are as vehement as the Asians with whom they work in denouncing the other Asians across the border.

Two old friends, one stationed in Saigon and the other in Phnom Penh, the capital of Cambodia, used to see eye to eye on most public issues. When they see each other now, they find themselves arguing continually about whether South Vietnam or Cambodia is in the right in the quarrels between them.

An obvious solution to this second question is to shift the Americans around more and more often to prevent them from developing "localities."

The first question is more difficult. The plain fact is that some of the countries in southeast Asia hate each other more than they hate the Communists.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Feb. 12, 1963]

ASIA'S FRONTIERS OF FREEDOM—TREND TOWARD NATIONALISM IN JAPAN; PACIFISM DECLINING, TRADE WITH REDS INCREASING—GROWING UNWILLINGNESS TO FOLLOW U.S. LEAD IN POLICY OF CONTAINING CHINA IS EXPECTED TO RESULT FROM ECONOMIC PRESSURES, NATIONAL PRIDE

(By Richard Dudman)

(Ninth of a series)

A new nationalism is stirring in Japan. It shows itself in such diverse ways as a modest rebirth of militarism and plans for increased trade with Communist Russia and China.

The new tendency toward militarism is nothing spectacular yet. It is hardly comparable to the public interest in the military to be found in most Western countries.

What makes it significant is that it represents a sharp change from the extreme and emotional pacifism that swept the country after its defeat in World War II.

Japanese children now are beginning once more to play with guns. Most Japanese parents forbade such toys in the earlier post-war years.

Children swarmed to a military exhibition sponsored last year outside Tokyo by a Japanese newspaper. They climbed enthusiastically on American guns and tanks lent for the occasion, just as American children

admire weapons at a military show in the United States.

The Government appears to encourage the trend. It sponsors a serial show on the Nippon educational television station, depicting the lives of soldiers in glorifying terms.

Applications for the Japanese military academy are up, running 25 for every acceptance. In previous years even the free bachelor's degree offered by the institution had not proved sufficient lure to outweigh the strong pacifist inclinations of most Japanese.

Kokushikan University in Tokyo, a conservative school, has reinstituted a feudalistic form of dueling called kendo, which was prohibited during the occupation.

The 45-year-old institution expects to increase its enrollment from the present 3,000 to 10,000 in the next 5 years. But it still is not comparable to the big universities of Japan, where Zengakuren, the leftist student federation, is a strong influence.

"We have no Zengakuren, no Communists, no pacifists—just patriots," a sociology professor said.

In practicing kendo, students face each other in pairs, armed with long bamboo sticks and wearing black plastic chest protectors, heavy gloves, baggy dark blue trousers, and helmets of heavy steel wire.

At the instructor's signal, the duellists begin howling in mock frenzy and whack each other with all their might. The beating of a drum halts each round and the instructor decides winners on points.

The sociology professor explained that the sport builds strength of muscle and character. "We lost the war because you were too strong," he said.

The trend to militarism is limited mainly to children and young men. Middle aged and older men, as well as most women, seem to remain strongly pacifist.

Japan is building its own natural uranium reactor and could eventually produce its own atomic bombs. But any talk of bombs or plutonium, their raw material, is still as taboo as ever.

Strong pressure has developed for a revision of article 9 of the Japanese Constitution, which renounces war, but there is still strong resistance to any change in this provision.

Article 9, virtually dictated by Gen. Douglas MacArthur, says:

"Aspiring sincerely to an international peace based on justice and order, the Japanese people forever renounce war as a sovereign right of the nation and the threat or use of force as a means of settling international disputes."

"In order to accomplish the aim of the preceding paragraph, land, sea, and air forces, as well as other war potential, will never be maintained. The right of belligerency of the state will not be recognized."

Japan has long since circumvented article 9. With the encouragement and help of the United States, it began rearming near the start of the Korean war. Japan called its new armed forces "self-defense forces," rather than an army, navy, and air force.

These now number 171,500 men in ground units, 32,000 in sea units, and 38,500 in air units. The 242,000 men operate nearly 1,000 tanks and motorized guns, 200 ships and 1,100 planes.

Proposed revision of article 9 is one of several possible constitutional changes being studied by a committee of experts named in 1957. The group has taken testimony from hundreds of witnesses and has presented 19 interim reports. Its final report is due sometime this year.

The movement for increased trade with Communist China finds support in the Japanese tradition of close relations with the mainland. In 1928, 26 percent of Japan's

exports went to China. In 1961, the fraction was only 0.4 percent—an amount only one-tenth of Japan's trade with Formosa.

Trade grew for a few years starting in 1955 under a government-to-government trade agreement. But the Chinese denounced the agreement in 1958 after rightists tore down a Chinese flag, at a trade fair in Nagasaki.

Behind that incident was a dispute over whether Japan would permit the flag to fly as a right and thus take a step toward recognition of Communist China. The Chinese since then have generally insisted that improvements in trade relations be accompanied by improvements in political relations.

Other obstacles to a resumption of the trade with the mainland are the strong opposition of Chiang Kai-shek's government in Formosa and of the United States. Japanese leaders fear that both will retaliate if Japan disregards their objections.

New negotiations began last summer, when Premier Chou En-lai sent an emissary to speak with Kenzo Matsumura, an elder statesman of the ruling Liberal-Democratic Party. He is sometimes known as the Cyrus Eaton of Japan.

At Chou's invitation, Matsumura went to China for 2 weeks last September and came back with an enthusiastic report that China was prepared to trade salt, soybeans, corn, and iron ore for Japanese fertilizer, urgently needed to increase China's agricultural output.

Matsumura's understanding was that Japan could enter into expanded trade with China without becoming involved in any political conditions. Some Japanese told themselves such an arrangement would be acceptable to the United States. They had read into some congressional reports and some campaign statements by President Kennedy the unjustified conclusion that the United States was preparing to recognize Communist China and adopt a "two Chinas" policy.

Tatsunosuke Takasaki, former minister of trade and now chairman of the Dai-Nippon Fishery Association, thereupon went to work to organize a mission to China.

The steel and fertilizer industries were reluctant to support the move. Each had an eye on Washington and the fertilizer industry was fearful of a boycott by its big customers in Formosa and South Korea.

Takasaki talked target figures with the Chinese, leaving details and credit arrangements for later discussions. Steel and fertilizer representatives watched with interest and are said now to be swinging toward participation.

These talks have been entirely private, on the Japanese side. Eventually, however, they will require some sort of government blessing, since they involve the biggest Japanese industries.

Meanwhile, two other groups, the Japan-China Trade Promotion Association and the Japan International Trade Promotion Association, have signed a trade protocol in Peiping, calling for increased trade between the two countries.

Reflecting a leftist slant of the two Japanese organizations, the protocol recognized China's three political principles governing commerce—Japan must avoid enmity toward China, will take no part in the "U.S. plot" of creating "two Chinas," and will not impede the development of normal relations between the two countries.

These organizations are said to represent a number of smaller commercial firms that want trade with China and have no objections to political entanglements, as well as some dummy firms that actually are subsidiaries of large, well-known companies that dare not seek such trade openly.

Economic pressures are combining with an independent pride of country to lead Japan

to take its own place in the affairs of Asia and the world. The outlook is for Japan to be gradually less willing to follow America's lead in its policy of isolating and containing Communist China.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Feb. 13, 1963]

ASIA'S FRONTIERS OF FREEDOM—CHINA APPARENTLY IN UPTURN AFTER MISCALCULATING GREAT LEAP FORWARD IN ITS ECONOMY—MUCH OF AMERICAN WISHFUL THINKING ABOUT COMMUNIST CHINESE FOUND TO BE BASED ON MYTHS—WALL OF IGNORANCE MAINTAINED BY BOTH COUNTRIES

(By Richard Dudman)

(Last of a series)

Much American thinking about Communist China is based on myths repeated so often that they have been widely accepted as true.

These are:

That the Chinese are suffering from widespread starvation.

That Chinese industrialization failed because Communist organization, particularly in the communes, was ruthless and unpopular.

That dissatisfaction is so general that internal revolt is a very real possibility and could be touched off by an invasion from Formosa.

These beliefs, together with China's bitter split with the Soviet Union over strategy against the West, give basis for a feeling that the problem of China, distasteful as it is just now, will eventually solve itself.

A further easy assumption holds that when the Communist regime finally collapses the Chinese people will return with relief to their traditional friendship with the United States.

Information gathered by a Post-Dispatch reporter-photographer team touring the southern rim of China indicates that these widely held beliefs and expectations are false, a compound of exaggeration, wishful thinking, misinformation, and ignorance about what is going on in the biggest country in the world with its 700 million population.

The ignorance is due mainly to an artificial wall erected between the United States and China after the Chinese Communists gained control in 1949. Both countries work at keeping the wall nearly impenetrable. With few exceptions, both stand in the way of Americans who would like to visit the Chinese mainland.

Almost all American passports bear the printed prohibition: "This passport is not valid for travel to or in Communist-controlled portions of China, Korea, Vietnam, or to or in Albania."

The principal exceptions are for 34 news organizations that the State Department has judged to be qualified and six persons who have visited relatives held prisoner in China.

Edgar Snow, one of the few Americans to obtain a visa to enter Communist China, visited the country in 1960 and related his experiences in the book "The Other Side of the River," published last November. He said the State Department authorized the trip only after he became a correspondent for Look magazine, on the approved list. China, on the other hand, admitted him only as a writer and not as a news correspondent.

Barred from entering the country, an American investigator must resort to the data and analyses of the many China watchers operating in Hong Kong, Japan, Burma, India, and other countries around China's periphery. Some of these observers are working for the United States or other governments, some are supported by churches or other private institutions, some are self-supported through the sale of newsletters or intelligence reports.

Another source is the testimony of refugees who come out of China. Still another is the testimony of non-American businessmen, diplomats, and journalists who have traveled in China recently.

These sources must be considered in terms of their possible bias, and their information must be judged for plausibility and consistency.

What follows is a judgment on this basis of China's problems and prospects.

As for starvation, it does not exist on any large scale in China today. There is and always has been considerable hunger and some malnutrition. Imports of more than 10 million tons of grain from non-Communist countries in the last 2 years have been a heavy financial burden on the government. But the reports of mass starvation in recent years do not stand up as showing a repetition of the famines that have plagued China from time to time through the centuries.

One of the sources of starvation reports is Father Luis Ruiz, a Jesuit priest at the Portuguese colony of Macao, a peninsula and some islands on the China coast near Hong Kong. He greets several hundred refugees a month, feeding and housing those who cannot arrange to be smuggled to Hong Kong. He hears their stories and sees their hunger and judges that starvation in China is widespread.

He showed the Post-Dispatch team five farmers in their early twenties, who had arrived from China 6 days earlier. They were bright-eyed, strong muscled, and huskily built.

"They were starving when they arrived," said Father Ruiz. "We fattened them up."

A British physician, after examining a group of 200 newly arrived refugees, observed that they were hungry from a 5-day walk to freedom but concluded: "These people are not suffering from malnutrition."

He explained that malnutrition has specific symptoms—swollen stomachs and ankles and loss of hair. He said he saw no such signs.

China's economic breakdown, which began in 1958, is more complicated than the simple explanation that the people are starving and restless.

The trouble came after a first 5-year plan, 1953 through 1957, that American experts concede worked out rather well. Agricultural goals were modest, providing for a slight increase over population growth, and considerable progress was made in industrialization.

Suddenly, in 1957 and 1958, the Chinese stepped up the pace enormously in the "great leap forward." They set production goals that seemed astronomical and consolidated collective farms into rural communes of 3,000 to 4,000 persons. City communes engaged in such projects as building the famous backyard iron hearths, later dismantled and converted into larger and more practical blast furnaces.

American observers say the Chinese seemed to have gone mad, through a combination of national cockiness and an unrealistic ambition to overtake the Soviet Union and the United States as a great industrial power.

Some other observers think the scheme made sense in terms of China's needs and resources, notably its tremendous population, but foundered on two technical difficulties.

One was that the commune idea spread too fast for efficient organization. When it began in Honan Province, it caught public imagination as a quick jump to pure communism—from each according to his ability and to each according to his needs. It sounded like the ultimate welfare state. The communes spread like a flood through the country.

The other difficulty was statistical. Local bureaucrats exaggerated their production

figures to make a good showing against their high quotas. The cumulated errors resulted in the impossible 1958 harvest total announced as 375 million tons.

Believing its own figures, the Communist regime speeded up its industrialization program building new plants to be financed, it thought, out of surplus agricultural production. Farm acreage was cut back, in fact, to prevent anticipated overproduction.

The crash came late in 1960. The Chinese Government admitted the 1958 harvest had been overestimated and cut back the official total by one-third, to 250 million. Outside observers think the 1958 harvest was actually about 190 million to 200 million tons. That total still would have been the biggest harvest in Chinese history, but it was not enough to supply China's own needs, much less finance a construction boom.

Floods and droughts, combined with bad management based on bad statistics, caused poor harvests in 1959, 1960, and 1961.

The Government, in a drastic remedy, halted industrialization so suddenly that a foreign observer said the country looked like Pompeii after the eruption of Mount Vesuvius. Erection of buildings was halted at every stage of construction, as if by a blanket order from Peiping.

Industrial capacity was cut more than 90 percent, and 20 to 30 million persons were taken off industrial jobs and sent back to the farms. The rural communes were split into smaller units, and farmers were permitted to operate private plots once more.

Another step was to resume a national birth control program, interrupted when the "great leap forward" began and the theory was that the huge and growing population was China's single greatest resource.

Outside observers now estimate the 1962 harvest at around 200 million tons, about the 1957 level with allowance for the population increase since then. Grain purchases from the West are continuing.

Steel production was still dropping in 1962. From a peak of 18 million tons in 1960, it sank below 10 million tons. But these figures must be compared to the totals of 2,800,000 in 1955 and 5,300,000 in 1957.

Looking back at the economic difficulties, the trouble can be likened to the flight of an airplane. Managers of the economy overestimated its forward thrust, tried to climb too fast, and went into a stall.

As in aeronautics, an economy can come out of a stall without crashing if it has reached a sufficient altitude.

In China's case, the upturn seems to have occurred in time. The economy is making a gradual recovery. The big question now is whether China will try to resume the "great leap forward" and, if it does, whether it can do so with rational management. Technical publications have been preaching respect for honest statistics, suggesting that the Government has learned its lesson.

Estimates of morale inside China come largely from those who interview refugees. The significance of this testimony is not that the refugees are dissatisfied—that much is to be expected from those who are fleeing—but in two other comments frequently heard.

One is that they are proud of their country's new strength. They think they had to work too hard and had too little to eat, but younger refugees often credit the Communist regime with making China a powerful nation, able to command the fear and respect of the rest of the world and even stand off the armed might of the United States, in the Korean war. Even young Roman Catholic priests coming out of China have expressed pride in this new national strength.

The other significant refugee view is that the great majority, while ready to break with the Communist regime, has no desire to go to Formosa and come under the rule

of Chiang Kai-shek and the Chinese Nationalists. Energetic recruiting campaigns by the Nationalists among the refugees in Hong Kong have had meager success.

The surge of refugees last May, when the Communists inexplicably lowered the bars for a month and let 60,000 cross into Hong Kong, proved to some China-watchers that the Government had lost control for a time. To others, the important fact was that the Communists could reimpose control without stirring mass violence among those who hoped to escape.

Internal collapse, at this point, seems out of the question. Some of the China-watchers, however, cling to the hope that Chiang can and will trigger a successful counter-revolution by undertaking a full-scale invasion.

"If the Nationalists could establish a bridgehead in Shanghai," said one of these China hands, not an American, "it would be a place where the Chinese could run to. This would require U.S. assistance, of course. The bridgehead would be a magnet for a stream of defectors. The regime eventually would fall."

This speculation leaves out of account a widespread propaganda-fostered hatred of Chiang and the United States. Chiang's threats of an invasion, together with small-scale landing attempts last summer, mean to many Chinese that the only alternative to Communist rule is a new dictatorship under Chiang.

In the eyes of China's leaders, the United States is an implacable enemy that pushed up to China's border in the Korean war and continues now to encourage Chiang in his dream of returning victoriously to the mainland. Some qualified Western observers in China have found this view widely held among the Chinese people.

If the People's Republic of China is here to stay, what of the future?

Historically, China is expansionist, and the rich rice-growing country of southeast Asia is a natural field for conquest. China's announced strategy is to encourage "wars of liberation" to overthrow the "bourgeois nationalist" regimes in the region.

But Red China's record of expansionism should not be exaggerated. China entered the Korean war only when American advances to the Yalu River threatened China's internal security and seemed on the point of proving to the rest of Asia that China could not save its one true satellite, North Korea, from extinction.

Along the Indian border, China has pursued strictly limited objectives, reestablishing its hold on disputed territory in the west and withdrawing voluntarily after administering a humiliating defeat to India in the east.

In Vietnam, it would be a simple matter for China to step up the scale of the guerrilla war against the South Vietnamese regime and its American support. So far, China has accepted a leisurely timetable, relying mainly on encouragement through propaganda blasts against the Diem government and the "American imperialists."

In the rest of southeast Asia, China has been practicing peaceful coexistence where it can, competing economically with the aid programs of the Soviet Union and the United States. The common American picture of Communist China as a threatening monster about to gobble up southeast Asia is not shared by most southeast Asians.

The bitter dispute between Communist China and the Soviet Union breaks the pattern of a monolithic Communist bloc following a consistent policy in southeast Asia, just as differences among Western powers had long since broken the pattern of a unified West building a wall of containment around Communist China.

American policy in southeast Asia is still centered on a constant threat of military action against Communist China by the

American-backed nationalist forces on Formosa, followed, so it is hoped, by an internal breakdown. Other national regimes in the area are still judged mainly on the basis of their anticommunism rather than their acceptance at home as expressing the national self-interests of their own countries.

But the overriding aspirations of the peoples of southeast Asia is not the downfall of Communist China or even the promotion of democracy and free enterprise. Nor is it the downfall of Western imperialism, as the Communists would have them believe.

They aspire, instead, to their own self-determination, their own political and economic independence. Big power policies, whether by East or West, that neglect this basic fact must fail in the long run.

TRIBUTE TO VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I wish to state to the Vice President that I am profoundly delighted, as I am sure every other Member of the Senate is, by his constantly being in attendance in presiding over the deliberations of this body. It has been a source of strength to me to see the Vice President here day after day, especially in view of the length of time he is assigning to this important task.

It gives a Senator comfort and strength to see the Vice President listening attentively to what is going on.

DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL INTEREST BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have long believed that the Congress should provide a code of ethics for its Members and employees, and that the public good requires it. Accordingly, together with my colleague [Mr. KEATING], I have submitted Senate Concurrent Resolution 5, to establish a Joint Committee on Ethics, which would develop and recommend such a comprehensive code for congressional adoption, and I have introduced S. 281, to make congressional communications with Federal regulatory agencies matters of public record.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 5 provides an interim code of ethics for the guidance of Members and employees during the period prior to the adoption of a comprehensive code. One of its requirements—which comes from the New York State Code—is that Members "having a financial interest, direct or indirect, having a value of \$10,000 or more, in any activity which is subject to the jurisdiction of a regulatory agency" make a matter of public record the nature of such interest, by filing a statement with the Comptroller General.

Since Senate Concurrent Resolution 5 has not yet been agreed to, the Comptroller General does not have authority to receive and maintain such lists. However, in order to demonstrate my concern with the matter, I am now making a statement for the RECORD. As of this date, my holdings of the described nature are as follows:

As trustee of a family trust, I have an indirect interest in the following companies or their subsidiaries or affiliates; these are normal investments in publicly owned corporations, with no

element of control alone or in combination with others: American & Foreign Securities Corp., Cities Service Corp., Criterion Insurance Co., Government Employees Corp., Government Employees Financial Corp., Government Employees Insurance Co., Government Employees Life Insurance Co., Sinclair Oil & Gas Co., South Carolina Electric & Gas Co., Southern Co., and Transamerica Corp. of Delaware.

UNITED NATIONS BONDS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it will be recalled that the matter of United Nations bonds was a hotly controverted issue in the Senate. Last September the Congress passed legislation by which the United States agreed to purchase the United Nations bonds on a matching basis—a formula which I am honored to say I had a part in drafting. Therefore, Mr. President, it is a matter of great satisfaction to me to be able to state that a recent United Nations report shows that so far a total of 58 nations have purchased or signified their intention to buy United Nations bonds, and that the total amount pledged or paid is now more than \$137 million.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a United Nations press release listing the nations, the amounts, and the dates of the purchases of United Nations bonds, paid or pledged, to February 15, 1963.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED NATIONS BONDS

On February 14, India and the Netherlands purchased United Nations bonds to the value of U.S. \$2 million and U.S. \$1,333,000 respectively, bringing to \$124,238,680 the total actual payments made for the purchase of such bonds.

India became the 40th country to buy United Nations bonds, while the Netherlands fulfilled its pledge of April 4, 1962, to buy \$2,020,000 worth of bonds. The Netherlands had made an earlier purchase of \$687,000 on October 19, 1962.

A total of 58 governments have either bought United Nations bonds or announced their intention to do so, and the total amount paid or pledged, including the matching increase by the United States, is \$137,670,937. Details of these purchases and pledges are as follows:

Country	Amount in U.S. dollars	Date of purchase
Purchases:		
Afghanistan.....	25,000	Oct. 3, 1962
Australia.....	4,000,000	June 15, 1962
Burma.....	100,000	Nov. 30, 1962
Cameroon.....	9,569	Oct. 24, 1962
Canada.....	6,240,000	Oct. 8, 1962
Ceylon.....	25,000	Oct. 23, 1962
China.....	500,000	Dec. 17, 1962
Denmark.....	2,500,000	Mar. 23, 1962
Federal Republic of Germany.....	10,000,000	Oct. 15, 1962
Federation of Malaya.....	340,000	July 25, 1962
Finland.....	1,480,000	Mar. 8, 1962
Greece.....	10,000	Aug. 23, 1962
Honduras.....	10,000	Jan. 3, 1963
Iceland.....	80,000	Mar. 27, 1962
India.....	2,000,000	Feb. 14, 1963
Indonesia.....	200,000	Aug. 1, 1962
Ireland.....	300,000	June 13, 1962
Israel.....	200,000	May 1, 1962
Italy.....	8,990,000	May 2, 1962
Ivory Coast.....	60,000	Oct. 2, 1962
Jordan.....	25,000	July 6, 1962
Korea, Republic of.....	400,000	Dec. 7, 1962
Kuwait.....	1,000,000	July 18, 1962
Lebanon.....	8,271	Nov. 15, 1962
Luxembourg.....	100,000	Dec. 27, 1962

Country	Amount in U.S. dollars	Date of purchase
Purchases—Continued		
Morocco.....	280,000	Dec. 6, 1962
Netherlands.....	2,020,000	Oct. 19, 1962
New Zealand.....	500,000	Feb. 14, 1963
Nigeria.....	1,000,000	June 15, 1962
Norway.....	1,800,000	Dec. 15, 1962
Sierra Leone.....	28,000	Mar. 8, 1962
Sweden.....	50,000	Sept. 24, 1962
Switzerland.....	5,800,000	May 18, 1962
Thailand.....	1,900,000	Nov. 15, 1962
Togo.....	160,000	Nov. 15, 1962
Tunisia.....	10,000	May 29, 1962
United Kingdom.....	485,000	June 27, 1962
United States.....	12,000,000	Oct. 31, 1962
Vietnam.....	59,672,840	Nov. 2, 1962
Pledges:		
Austria.....	10,000	Dec. 21, 1962
Brazil.....	10,000	July 11, 1962
Cambodia.....	900,000	Mar. 19, 1962
Cyprus.....	100,000	Aug. 10, 1962
Ecuador.....	5,000	May 14, 1962
Ethiopia.....	26,175	Apr. 4, 1962
Ghana.....	12,000	June 10, 1962
Iran.....	200,000	Mar. 20, 1962
Iraq.....	100,000	July 20, 1962
Japan.....	500,000	Apr. 5, 1962
Liberia.....	100,000	Oct. 5, 1962
Mauritania.....	5,000,000	July 13, 1962
New Zealand.....	200,000	Mar. 30, 1962
Pakistan.....	4,082	July 19, 1962
Panama.....	500,000	Apr. 27, 1962
Philippines.....	25,000	Feb. 14, 1962
Turkey.....	750,000	June 15, 1962
United Arab Republic.....	100,000	Aug. 30, 1962
Venezuela.....	100,000	Dec. 5, 1962
Yugoslavia.....	250,000	July 2, 1962
	300,000	Apr. 13, 1962
	200,000	June 8, 1962

(Yugoslavia handed over a check for \$100,000 to the United Nations on January 2, 1963, but has yet to take receipt of the United Nations bond.)

FREE WORLD UNITY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, one of the prime architects of free world unity, who has done pioneer work in bringing Europe together into a strong economic partnership, is Jean Monnet, really the father of the European Common Market and the European Coal and Steel Community. On January 23, 1963, M. Monnet was presented the annual Freedom Award for outstanding service in the cause of freedom, at a Freedom House dinner in New York City. In his acceptance address M. Monnet emphasized the tremendous potential of the European Common Market in cooperation with the United States as a powerful force for peace and the common defense of the free world.

I consider it a great honor and privilege to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the acceptance address by M. Monnet, and the message from President Kennedy which was read by Under Secretary of State George W. Ball.

There being no objection, the letter and the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE 1962 FREEDOM AWARD TO JEAN MONNET TEXT OF LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

DEAR MR. MONNET: I am delighted to join my friends at Freedom House in doing honor to your great achievements. You come at a moment of high importance, and you come as the exemplar of disinterested service to Europe and to the Atlantic world.

For centuries, emperors, kings, and dictators have sought to impose unity on Europe by force. For better or worse, they have failed. But under your inspiration, Europe has moved closer to unity in less than 20 years than it had done before in a thousand.

You and your associates have built with the mortar of reason and the brick of economic and political interest. You are transforming Europe by the power of a constructive idea.

Ever since the war the reconstruction and the knitting together of Europe have been objectives of U.S. policy, for we have recognized with you that a strong Europe would be good not only for Europeans but for the world. America and a united Europe, working in full and effective partnership, can find solutions to those urgent problems that confront all mankind in this crucial time.

I have been happy, therefore, to read your statement of January 16 in which you call attention to the responsibility of Europe to share with the United States in the common defense of the West. I believe, with you, that Americans and Europeans must recognize that neither one nor the other is defending a particular country, but that the ensemble is defending a common civilization. The United States will be true to this conviction, and we trust that it will have the support of Europeans, too.

Your practical wisdom, your energy in persuasion, your tested courage, and your earned eminence in Europe are the reasons for this celebration in your honor. They are also a great resource for freedom, and I wish you many years of continued strength in your service to our cause.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

ADDRESS BY M. JEAN MONNET

Your Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, I am very honored to receive from the board of trustees of Freedom House the Freedom Award at your hands today.

That you are giving this award to a European is to me a proof of the deep community of mind and feeling that unite the people of Europe and North America.

I am convinced that this feeling is rooted in our common civilization, the essence of which is its tradition of freedom. This freedom truly is the main issue between the two ways of approaching life that compete for men's minds today.

So many people have written and spoken about liberty more thoroughly than I can that I want to limit myself to what seems to me the most important and urgent practical problem confronting the West and its traditions of freedom, the one that requires action from us today.

The worst enemies of freedom have been, and still are, the spirit of domination and its consequence, the threat of war.

While within our frontiers we have organized liberty and, by mutual consent, maintained the rule of law that largely eliminates the spirit of domination, internationally we are still maintaining peace by force.

Now we must go beyond national frontiers and create new forms of relationships between our countries.

The next step ahead of us must clearly be to complete the unity of Europe including Britain, and gradually develop a strong partnership of equals between the United States and Europe.

These are essential for the organization of peace in the world and the maintenance of freedom.

For, as we progress toward the unity of the West, we will create the conditions favoring a lasting peace between the West and the Soviet Union.

Naturally, the process of putting these great aims into practice involves great changes in the form of relationships now existing between our nations. This brings us up against difficulties.

I would like to talk of the one that looms largest over all at this moment.

It is more than important, it is essential that Britain should join our European Community under the same conditions as the present members.

The negotiations have been going on too long, but they can be rapidly concluded.

We must remember that on fundamental issues, as two World Wars have proved, Britain is part of Europe.

People in Britain and on the Continent must free their minds of the obsolete and static idea that Britain, because an island, is bound to be insular, that she does not belong to Europe and that her commercial policies and interests will keep her forever apart from the natural trend toward unity of Europe.

Entry into Europe would be good for Britain, for Europe, for the West and for world peace.

I still hope and believe, like most people in the six, that the negotiations on Britain's entry into Europe will succeed.

Those who had anything to do with European unity know from their own experience that the difficulties encountered at any moment do not matter so long as the objective is kept clearly in view.

The world has recently become aware of the success of European economic unity, and people everywhere see political unity emerging in Europe. But this sudden awareness has concealed the 12 years of work and often of serious trouble that lie behind the achievement.

When the treaty of the European Defense Community was rejected in 1954, most competent observers thought unity in Europe was dead and buried. And yet the progress we have made during the last 12 years shows that despite all the difficulties, we are on the way.

The countries of continental Europe—France, Germany, Italy, and Benelux—are uniting in a European Economic Community of nearly 200 million people.

Germany and France, which have struggled to dominate one another for centuries, are now coming together, accepting the fact that they have the same destiny. In the European Economic Community they are pursuing a common course which is gradually transforming their mutual relations and the outlook of their peoples. They have even been building recently the possibility of closer cooperation.

I have no doubt that France, from the start one of the promoters of the European unity, will follow this course in the future as in the past.

What are the simple reasons that made these changes happen?

It is because the countries of the European Community have agreed that their economic problems which, in the past, were national responsibilities, have now become common responsibilities and being common, unite them instead of dividing them.

It is because they have established common rules and common institutions that they can do the job.

It is because each of the steps they have taken one after the other, as circumstances allowed, have been designed to further the same objective.

The European Coal and Steel Community, which was at the beginning of all this enterprise, was not set up just to pool coal and steel, but as a first step on the way to European union.

The Common Market has not been created just to build a better system of exchanging goods, or to create a new power. We had, and have, as our objectives essentially the creation of a united Europe and the elimination between nations and their peoples of the spirit of domination that has brought the world close to destruction many times.

To produce such a change, it was essential to eliminate the feeling of discrimination between nations—the feeling that was the inevitable consequence of the many European wars.

To begin to unite Europe only 5 years after the war, it was vital that everyone

should see that there were no more victors or vanquished, but only partners equal before the common law.

The institutions of the Common Market work in such a way that discrimination between European nations has now been ended.

The independent European Commission is the authority empowered to propose the economic policies of the Community. The national governments whose representatives sit in the Council of Ministers, decide on the common policies proposed by the Commission according to the rules and spirit of the Rome Treaty. In a widening field its decisions no longer require unanimity.

The attitudes of the people of Europe are rapidly changing. The peoples of these community countries, producers, farmers, labor and members of the professions, have become partners in change and are taking on the same community outlook. In fact, when you look at what's happening, these people are the same people as they have been for centuries but their attitudes today toward one another have changed, and this, in my opinion, is the process of civilization itself.

This process is taking us faster and farther than anyone would have dared to hope after the war.

Britain's request to enter European union is one sign.

Another is your President's speech of the last 4th of July, where he called for a partnership of equals between the United States of America and the European Community. You are now preparing to negotiate new trade links across the Atlantic which must serve the interests of the world as a whole.

Ever since the Marshall plan, and the Schuman plan, American support for European unity has never faltered.

I can testify from my own experience that this support has been invaluable in bringing European unity to the point where it is today. For once, the most powerful country in the world has helped others to unite instead of adopting the old principle of divide and rule.

But during all those years, the United States took her decisions alone. Now the partnership means a new form of relations.

Let me read to you what the Action Committee of the United States of Europe said on this matter in its joint declaration of June 26 last:

"The partnership between America and a united Europe must be a partnership of two separate but equally powerful entities, each bearing its share of common responsibilities in the world. This partnership is natural and inevitable because the peoples of Europe and America share the same civilization based on freedom and conduct their public life in accordance with common democratic principles."

I think this has implications for defense which, with the entry of Britain into the Common Market, is the main problem that looms over the great debate in the West.

We must recognize, in this nuclear age, that while making every effort to disarm, we must pursue and improve our common defense with all its political implications on both sides of the Atlantic.

Europe and America must both acknowledge that neither of us is defending a particular country, that we are all defending our common civilization.

You, in the United States, must realize that the claims of Europe to share common responsibility and authority for decisions on defense, including the nuclear weapons, is natural since any decision involves the very existence of the European peoples.

On the other hand, I think the Europeans must understand that the nuclear terror is indivisible and that they too must shoulder an adequate share of the common defense.

Today, however, the countries of the Atlantic Alliance have such divergent views of their immediate interests that a common ap-

proach to the problems has to be developed if agreement is to be achieved.

To achieve the partnership between Europe and America, we must create an increasingly common interest by acting in common on a growing number of questions. When sufficient points of common interest have been created, a degree of community in defense will be accepted that today appears utopian.

In my opinion, while progress on defense must be sought continuously, the field where results can be most promptly obtained is the economic one.

There are urgent problems which neither Europe nor America can settle alone. These are, to my mind, the monetary stability of the West, the organization of agriculture in an increasingly industrial world, help to the developing countries to speed their growth and, of course, the freeing of trade to be negotiated between yourselves and the Common Market.

I realize fully that economic partnership will not automatically lead to a partnership for defense. In Europe, too, the Common Market alone is not enough to create political union. But without the Common Market, political union would never have been raised as a practical issue. Similarly, the creation of the rules and institutions needed to build up the economic partnership between the United States and Europe will change the context for dealing with defense. It will then appear in a new light on both sides of the Atlantic.

The unity of Europe and its partnership with the United States will not only change the relationship between us, it will fundamentally change the relationship of the West with the Soviet Union.

As long as Russia believes the West can be divided, it will be tempted to upset the balance of power in its favor.

As we organize new forms of relationship between the Western nations, we will be showing ourselves, the Soviet Union, and the rest of the world, that as a result of the union of Europe and its partnership with the United States, the West cannot be divided.

The conditions will then exist for establishing the basis of lasting peace between the Soviet Union and ourselves.

I believe this development can come much faster than we imagine today. My hope is based on my experience of European unity. This experience has been that once people are convinced a new situation is inevitable, they adapt themselves to it spontaneously and by doing so, hasten the process itself.

This is the most hopeful road to the creation of peace today, and to the consolidation of freedom.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the independence of Estonia was celebrated on February 24, the 45th anniversary of this historic event in the life of the Estonian people. They proclaimed their Republic in 1918, after two centuries of Russian rule; but they enjoyed self-government for only two decades. In 1940, the Soviet Russian armies swept over the Baltic States, and brought the Republic to an end.

Communist repressive measures have ruthlessly put down all manifestations by the Estonian people of their hope for freedom and independence; but the flame of liberty still continues to burn high. The United States has steadfastly upheld the principle of self-determination, and will continue to press for the recognition of this basic right until all the captive peoples of Europe are freed

from the oppressive rule of their Communist overlords. Our voices in commemoration of this anniversary of freedom will help to keep hope alive in the hearts of the Estonian people.

TRIBUTE TO BRIG. GEN. HERBERT D. VOGEL

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I am genuinely sorry to learn that Brig. Gen. Herbert D. Vogel, U.S. Army, retired, is leaving Tennessee, his adopted State for the past 9 years.

General Vogel served as Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority from 1954 until last summer, when he resigned, and was succeeded on the Board of Directors by the Honorable Frank Smith, a former Member of Congress from Mississippi.

As the appointee of an administration that was less than enthusiastic about the TVA, General Vogel at first was regarded with suspicion by many of those in the valley and in Washington who had worked to establish the TVA as the finest example of regional resource development in the world.

However, as often happens to those who are exposed directly to the things that make it great, General Vogel became one of the TVA's most outspoken champions. I recall that once a Texas physician wrote to complain that he did not want his tax money spent for such socialistic enterprises as TVA dams. General Vogel, who had spent much of his adult life in river and harbor development work for the Engineers, wrote back that the Government seemed to be spending more of the taxpayers' money to build dams in Texas than to build dams in the Tennessee Valley, and asked whether the doctor would like to "squawk" about that.

I should also like to remind the Senate that it was during General Vogel's tenure as TVA Chairman that identical bidding on TVA purchases of electrical equipment was exposed through the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly—a development quickly followed by the impaneling of a Federal grand jury at Philadelphia, and the indictment and conviction of a large number of individuals and corporations in the electrical equipment industry. The cooperation which General Vogel caused to be accorded by the TVA to our subcommittee was excellent and was fully in the public interest.

Both during his service as TVA Chairman and afterward, General Vogel took an active interest in the affairs of the community, Knoxville, and of the State in which he lived. Indeed, upon his departure from the TVA, he was sought as a candidate for election as Governor of Tennessee; but he declined to run.

According to news reports from Knoxville, General Vogel has closed the consulting engineer's office he had opened in Knoxville after leaving the TVA, and he and Mrs. Vogel plan to move to some place in the East. I wish them well, and I say again that Tennessee will miss them.

TRIBUTE TO MAJ. GEN. HAROLD K. JOHNSON, COMMANDANT OF THE COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF COLLEGE AND COMMANDING GENERAL OF FORT LEAVENWORTH

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, Maj. Gen. Harold K. Johnson has endeared himself to the citizens of Leavenworth, Kans. As a gesture of appreciation, the chamber of commerce, Central Trades & Labor Union, and the National Federation of Federal Employees issued a resolution, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD together with names and editorial entitled "We Lose an Outstanding Citizen," published in the Leavenworth Times of February 1, 1963.

There being no objection, the resolution and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A JOINT RESOLUTION ISSUED BY AND FOR THE CITIZENS OF LEAVENWORTH, KANS., FEBRUARY 15, 1963

(To be read before the U.S. House of Representatives by the Honorable WILLIAM H. AVERY, of Kansas, with his personal comments added)

Resolved, That it is with deep regret that the city of Leavenworth and its citizens have received the news that Maj. Gen. Harold K. Johnson will leave his command at Fort Leavenworth for a new assignment in Washington on February 25, 1963. Having witnessed General Johnson's exceptional ability at work, it should not have been unexpected to see him moved prior to a "normal" period of duty; nevertheless, the action was met with surprise mingled with regret.

The city of Leavenworth has seen many commanding generals at Fort Leavenworth. None have captured the esteem, respect, and downright admiration of the citizens of Leavenworth as General Johnson has. Several came close, but did not reach General Johnson's mark.

General Johnson's devotion of time and talent to what may be called civic affairs has been little short of amazing. No native civilian could have done more to promote the welfare of Leavenworth.

What we in Leavenworth think of General Johnson may best be summarized by the following editorial published in the Leavenworth Times February 1, 1963:

"WE LOSE AN OUTSTANDING CITIZEN"

"The Leavenworth community will lose an outstanding citizen the last of this month when Maj. Gen. Harold K. Johnson, commandant of the Command and General Staff College and commanding general of Fort Leavenworth, leaves for a new assignment at the Pentagon.

"To say that General Johnson is popular is to use a trite expression but Webster's dictionary defines popular as a person having many friends, and certainly the general has a multitude of friends in both Leavenworth and Fort Leavenworth.

"In the city, he took an active part in civic and social affairs. He served on committees, both as member and chairman, for projects devoted to the welfare of the community. For this work he was given a man of the hour award by the chamber of commerce last year.

"At the fort he has been active in school and Boy Scout work and was awarded the Silver Beaver, one of scouting's top awards by the Kaw Council. Park College conferred an honorary doctor of education degree in recognition of his work in public relations.

"General Johnson had already established himself as a top military leader before his

assignment to Fort Leavenworth and it didn't take long for people in this area to recognize his leadership in civic affairs. He has been in demand as a speaker in the Midwest because of his forceful presentations of world and military affairs in words that are easily understood.

"Because of his success in getting things done and securing cooperation within the combined community of the two Leavenworths, he leaves a tough mark to shoot at for his successor, Maj. Gen. Harry J. Lemley, Jr. Both generals will start their new assignments with best wishes for continued success by friends and coworkers here."

J. F. MITCHELL,

Mayor, City of Leavenworth.

IVAN J. MEYER,

President,

Leavenworth Chamber of Commerce.

IVAN MARSHALL,

President,

Central Trades & Labor Council.

MILTON H. STROH,

Public Relations Officer,

EDWARD F. LARKIN,

Public Relations Officer,

National Federation of Federal

Employees, Local 49

(For Alfred E. Michael, President).

ALF M. LANDON'S COUNSEL ON CURRENT DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, many years have passed since Alf Landon carried the Republican Party's banner in its campaign for the Presidency. In the years since, Mr. Landon has demonstrated his wisdom and sound judgment as a spokesman on public issues and as a counsel to his fellow Kansans and to those in the highest places of Government. As with many men of character and wisdom, the years have brought increasing respect and admiration.

I ask unanimous consent at this time to have printed in the RECORD the recent address which Mr. Landon delivered to the Washington County Bar Association at Bartlesville, Okla., on February 28, 1963, in order that I might call to the attention of the Senate and to all of those who read this RECORD his sound counsel on current domestic and international affairs.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

(Address by Hon. Alf M. Landon)

I speak on international politics not as an expert steeped in classified information on foreign affairs.

I speak simply as one with some experience in politics, with a background of history, and close reading of world daily political events, viewing international politics as I would American politics.

It is obvious that economic problems and troubles in a country mold its foreign policies. Even in a rich and powerful country like these United States, the Secretary of Defense stresses the saving of billions of dollars that will be saved by abandoning bombers for missiles.

That decision involving life or death matters of our great country as a Nation of free people was made in the Pentagon by civilians over all the general staff, except Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, the appointee for the President to head the general staff.

Of course, there are other factors involved than economic. I have previously spoken of

the tendency of generals to start the next war with the last war's weapons.

Nevertheless, I believe we can afford what engineers call a margin of safety in our calculations for military defense equipment. Certainly the Congress should give this decision by civilians a hard, thorough, and objective going over.

Just as there is political chaos prevailing today in international relations, so is there growing confusion in labor, business, and farming over our President's fiscal policies.

The Kennedy administration has called for a startling departure in fiscal policy. In a nutshell, this new policy is that taxes be substantially cut and expenditures substantially increased. This policy request comes after years of deficit spending and from an administration that has pledged itself to fighting the inflationary tendencies in our economy.

The question that we as citizens must ask is, What is behind this new policy call? It has been said that the practice of cutting taxes while increasing expenditures has been tried successfully in other countries. Yet what country has an economy as complex as that of the United States?

What complicated, stable economy has proportionately—

1. A National, State, and local debt the size of ours;

2. A tax load the size of ours—in 1961, National, State, and local taxes claimed 35 percent of our national income;

3. Defense and foreign aid commitments the size of ours; and

4. The freedom to act that is still possessed by our businessmen, bankers, and labor unions?

If the administration is experimenting rather than following an applicable precedent, as it would appear, it should say so. We Americans are not temperamentally opposed to experimentation.

Every President since Harding—including Kennedy—has tried one or more economic policies and failed to secure either economic stability or political calm or a debt reduction, or all three, for any length of time. We have fortunately survived these experiments so that we could experiment another day to try to improve our economic situation without losing our political freedoms. Yet the fact is that we are challenged to do just that in the Keynesian-Kennedy Government-financing policies.

One can sympathize with President Kennedy and appreciate his concern. The question is, Is this policy, if implemented, likely to achieve positive goals that will benefit the whole country? In other words—to avoid disastrous results for our country—I am only asking questions which must be asked and have yet not been answered satisfactorily by the administration.

1. Can the rise in the national debt and the presumed increase in private credit and spending (which should occur with increased Government expenditures and reduced taxes) be such that they will not lead to an inflationary spiral that would wipe out the tax savings and rob savings of tens of millions of Americans—especially those who could least afford the loss—a result that would favor the nimble speculator instead of the businessman, laborer, or farmer?

2. Will the new policy give us the low-skilled jobs in work areas where unemployment is so pressing or will it open up new high-skilled jobs which we already find difficult to fill?

3. Will it really ease the citizens' tax load at a time when every State and locality is desperately seeking more revenue and would gladly fill any tax void created by the Federal Government? In considering this question, one must keep in mind that the demands upon the States and localities have been increasing and that they will increase

all the more if inflation is the result of new Federal policy.

4. Should inflation come, would it not ultimately pose the need to raise Federal taxes drastically to accommodate the needs of the Government for dollars to buy goods and services at inflated prices?

5. Can we persuade our sources of credit to cover what appears to be a substantial increase in the national debt as a result of the new policy, and if we can, would not this prevent the expansion of private credit at the rate anticipated by the administration?

6. Isn't it possible that the new policy would weaken our already touchy economic and political position with London, Bonn, Paris, Amsterdam, etc., which are now operating with conservative economic policies and have looked askance at the relatively mild deficit spending which we have engaged in during the past 5 years?

7. Will the new policy halt or increase the flow of gold, with which we are so much concerned?

The argument for the President's fiscal policy goes this way: The volume of business domestically and externally would be increased so much beyond tax cuts and increased Government spending that—assuming the supply and demand ratios were stable—the tax yield at reduced rates would keep the deficit down and the national debt manageable. For example, if the Government deficit ran—based on the present outlook—at \$20 billion annually for the next 5 years—that would mean theoretically an increase in the national debt of \$100 billion. If, however, business volume increased, thanks to these stimuli, at the rate of about 8 percent per annum, this would lead to an accumulated 5-year increase in the gross national income of \$400 billion which, if taxed at 20 percent, would yield \$80 billion extra in revenue and therefore leave only a new net debt of \$20 billion. That could of course be easily managed. Moreover, at this rate, by the sixth year the annual tax yield should be such that a balanced budget could be achieved.

Pretty good, if it can be done—disastrous if it does not work.

Therefore, it is time to take stock of the past and the future.

The fiscal policies recommended to the Congress by President Kennedy are loosely based on the economic theories of the English Lord Keynes. Keynes asserted that the national economy could grow by pumping Government money into the economy on a deficit spending basis. He sold the idea to the New Deal and Mr. Roosevelt in 1933. It did not work here and has not been adopted by any other country. The Keynesians could only lamely say it did not work because Mr. Roosevelt did not spend enough money.

This same idea—Lord Keynes' idea—now seems to be at the base of President Kennedy's new fiscal policy—but with one great difference: Keynes did not call for tax cuts to accompany increased Government spending. Apparently the new Keynesians have figured out that the real reason for Mr. Roosevelt's failure was not just that he did not spend enough but that the deficit was not great enough for us to spend our way so far into debt that we would reach greater prosperity. They have persuaded Mr. Kennedy that this explanation is economic gospel, and their only criticism of him is that he is not planning to spend more money and create a bigger deficit.

It will take at least 3 years for the Keynesian-Kennedy fiscal policy to prove itself. In the meantime, there are many other factors that will affect national growth besides taxation and the volume of spending. There are Government policies to be initiated and established on agriculture, trade, and labor. A disruptive factor is the dispute over wages and hours. The limits Mr. Kennedy placed

on hours and wages are rejected by the AFL-CIO and are now being set aside by the national administration. A rising tide of unemployment demands immediate and forthwith complete review by the Congress of all these factors in national growth to stimulate employment.

Then there is the international situation, which is now in greater flux because of France's refusal to let Britain join the Common Market.

There are the market demands. What will people and business do with their tax savings—if any really materialize? It must be evident that much will depend on the wisdom of business management. For illustration, if increased profits are used by railroads to improve their roadbeds and equipment, that, in turn, stimulates business. On the other hand, if increased profits are used for increased dividends to increase the price of stock on Wall Street, that will be inviting nationalization of railroads.

For sure, if business and employment do not grow, the administration will be forced to explain its failure not by admitting that the Keynesian-Kennedy fiscal theories were wrong, but that not enough money was spent and the deficit was not big enough.

President Kennedy might then ask Congress to spend more money, create a bigger deficit, and adopt more sweeping Government controls over business, labor, and farmers.

One can be sure that the leftwingers will try to foster a loss of public confidence in the capitalistic system—not in the Keynesian-Kennedy financial theories—despite the fact that communism's basic difficulty today is economics.

Whatever the decision of the Congress on the new fiscal policies of the President, it should have priority on the legislative calendar.

Uncertainty as to tax changes and inflation are a blight on business planning and markets. Merchants buying for the fall market are bound to take that into consideration.

In turn, that will affect employment in industry.

Therefore, the quicker that question of tax reduction and the changes in other taxation provisions are settled, the quicker business can plan for the next fiscal year starting July 1. That is also true of our industrial and agricultural planning for changes in foreign markets brought about by the EEC—commonly called the Common Market.

The free world has become so intermeshed that practically every economic decision America makes affects every free market in the world. That, in turn, affects their political and military policies.

It is not only a matter of logistics; it is also a matter of public uncertainty on what our new fiscal policy will be—and public psychology on inflation devaluing the dollar if it does not work. Our dollar is the corollary of the atom bomb in defense of the free world. The free world is as interested in keeping our dollar sound as in our atomic strength.

Yet not only economics but also politics shapes foreign relations. There is an atmosphere of intrigue—mystery, spies, and murder—clinging to the phrase "international politics."

International politics, however, is not just man-to-man combat, as in the spy movies, but a lethal contest that means life or death for millions. It is a contest that takes into account what we do and say at home, one that requires more restraint, moderation by the press, both political parties in discussing foreign affairs.

Yet this does not require that we as a nation or individuals not maneuver and comment on foreign policies. There is and must be maneuvering in foreign policies as there is in domestic policies.

As for maneuvering on foreign policies, I will not attempt to discuss that in terms of military hardware, combat troops, of positions of strength either for pagan tyrannical Communists or for popular democratic capitalistic governments with their proven record of contributing to the general good.

Neither will I attempt to reconcile the often puzzling declaration of President De Gaulle or Chancellor Adenauer of West Germany, Prime Minister Macmillan of England, and the other heads of European countries, or President Kennedy and Prime Minister Diefenbaker. I will simply say there is no principle involved between any of them similar to the one involved between Mao and Khrushchev.

It is apparent that China has won a victory over India. It appears that China's next step will be to attempt to consolidate some other Asian area under Communist domination.

Nehru said in a recent interview that Mao believes in a nuclear war and is thinking and planning that. He quotes Mao as saying, "What difference does 200 million lives make?" Mao himself has said that a country of 800 million people will have more left after a nuclear war than a country of 200 million people.

Hence there should not be a close and dependable alliance between China and Russia.

Furthermore, Chinese Communists are angry at the growing adoption of capitalistic production methods by occidental Communists. All that could mean if Khrushchev's present line is consistent—improving relations with European socialistic parties. In the latest news, Khrushchev is still harping on the economic collapse of decadent capitalistic states. But no responsive chord from Mao. A rising tide of nationalism is confounding communism in most countries.

Our foreign policy has been to defend the democratic governments of Europe—including England—and to build them up after two World Wars.

Having become economically strong, if Europe under the leadership of France now wants to decide its own policies and build its own defense weapons, I do not believe we can do much about it except be ready to cooperate at all times. We should help hold together in unity and strength the EEC. That organization has a better potential as a force for peace than SEATO, CENTRO, NATO, and the U.N. all put together.

It is obviously to the vital interests of West Germany to maintain close friendly relations with both France and the United States. That is true also for the United States of America. France is across the main supply lines to our troops in West Germany.

Then there is the crucial question of satisfactory trade agreements we must work out with the EEC.

The question of—After Adenauer and De Gaulle, what?—can be left for the future.

After all, we have done all we could to foster a United Europe, including England. Certainly a greater sharing and acceptance of the cost of defending the free world from Communist tyranny is long overdue by Europe, England, and other countries economically capable.

Berlin, Vietnam, and Cuba are where the evil intentions of the Soviet are now displayed. There is only one man in America that can put together for us the meaning of all these military and political situations and our answer to them. That man is the President of the United States. That does not mean that Members of the Congress—Republican or Democrat—should refuse to discuss foreign affairs. That is their obligation and duty to discuss them.

There is not a division between the two political parties on Cuba. Instead, there are two camps. While both agree with President Kennedy that Latin America is as critical as any area in the world today, they dis-

agree on the steps that should be taken to meet the Russian-Cuba center of that critical area. Once again Cuba is the focus of world attention.

Of course our country and the democratic world is nervous because of the failure of intelligence in the Bay of Pigs fiasco.

Even more so when there has been no adequate explanation of how the Russian missile buildup in Cuba went on for months, to the point of Russian missiles staring down the streets of every Atlantic city to some 1,500 miles inland without alarming our President.

According to a very dramatic thriller semi-official explanation, our President would not have known of that fateful massive installation if it had not been for a break in the clouds just prior to his October 22 address to the Nation. Yet, as early as May, Col. Robert S. Allen was writing in his column of the Russian missile buildup in Cuba. Senator KEATING, in September, was trying to arouse the administration to that danger.

Another reason for uneasiness is the administration's policy of not only managing—but suppressing—news threatening our military security. Of course, that went on in the preceding administration. We must rely, for adequate and proper press coverage of military events threatening our national security, on reporters who wear out their shoe leather instead of being satisfied with administrative news handouts.

The statement I most frequently hear is that America has no friends anywhere. I do not think that is so. The contradictions I have briefly mentioned are the contradictions inherent in democratic processes. Just as there are new weapons, new mass communication, new standards of living, maybe new worlds, we have a new kind of alliance—an alliance not for the perpetuation of a family on a throne, or for power, or for gold or trade.

The alliance of the Western World—NATO, OAS, SEATO are all based on the common bond of preservation and defense of democratic processes for all mankind against tyranny.

That is a connecting web that binds together the free world in the strength, characteristics, and ideals of the democratic processes. However strong that web, however dedicated a people are to their country's interest in that alliance, emergencies cannot be successfully met against a dominant dictator without a center of decision on diplomatic and military tactics.

By reason of our economic and military power, that place of decision has been forced on the President of the United States of America. There is a time for discussion and consultation. There is a time for instant decision, without talking things over. That's the way it will be for some time to come, providing there is clear direction and clear leadership.

In this contest with age-old tyranny, expressed in modern form by communism, we know the method of communism is to win by force and by fear. The volume and the variety of Communist lies are amazing. Forewarned is forearmed. Every Communist country in the world is ruled by a dictator. How fantastic to call them peoples democratic governments. Yet that is the Communist line. That line and the threat it represents must be met fortrightly to perpetuate the world democratic alliance.

That this is true is shown in a story on the installation of our President's Cuban quarantine last October. Our embassies the world over received the official explanation to be made to foreign diplomats.

One of our ambassadors started to make that explanation to a diplomatic caller. The veteran European ambassador was not interested. All he wanted to know was whether we were going through with it.

It is up to all Americans to show the world that we are going to stick to our policy regarding the imperialism of tyranny.

Our policy for 45 years has been to defend democratic processes in Europe at all cost against tyranny. That we will stick to. We have followed a similar policy in the Far East for over a decade. And that we will stick to. Can we do less for the Western Hemisphere—in Cuba—90 miles from our own coastline?

As I see it, the administration is continuing its policy of last November of quarantining Castro.

This is a realistic policy if it isolates the threat of communism in the Western Hemisphere. There is no easy answer in determining the steps that will have to be taken one by one in solving the Cuban question. That is why we need a national debate on its progress.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE JEAN FELIX PICCARD

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I would not want the Senate to fail to note the regrettable passing of one of the great scientists of America and the world—Dr. Jean Felix Piccard.

Professor emeritus of aeronautical engineering of the University of Minnesota, he was one of the great scientists of our time. A naturalized American citizen, he brought to this country excellence in stratospheric science, just as his famous brother brought excellence in oceanographic science.

The world can never have enough men of scientific and other genius such as Dr. Piccard represented. His loss was deeply felt throughout his adopted State of Minnesota, the Nation, and the world.

His talented wife, a distinguished scientist in her own right, and his family can feel a sense of deep pride in what this great man contributed throughout the 79 fruitful years of his life.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the Record an article which appeared in the Minneapolis Tribune, which summarizes his contributions, together with the biographical summary from "American Men of Science."

There being no objection, the article and summary were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

BALLOONIST JEAN PICCARD, 79, DIES ON BIRTHDAY

Dr. Jean Felix Piccard, internationally famous balloonist, died today on his 79th birthday.

Piccard, University of Minnesota professor emeritus of aeronautical engineering, was known for his stratospheric balloon flights and cosmic ray research.

He died at his home at 1445 East River Road at 2:30 a.m. He had had a heart condition for a number of years.

He was a member of the Piccard family of Basel, Switzerland, known for its scientific achievements. His twin brother, the late Auguste Piccard, was the first man to soar into the stratosphere and the first to plumb the ocean depths.

His nephew Jacques, Auguste's son, descended 37,800 feet to the bottom of the Pacific Ocean in 1960 in a bathyscaphe, an underwater vessel used for exploring ocean depths.

WIFE HELPED

Mrs. Jean Piccard worked with her husband in many of his studies and experiments.

Mr. Piccard studied at the Swiss Institute of Technology, Zurich, where he earned his

doctor of science degree in 1909. He served as private assistant to Adolph von Baeyer at the University of Munich from 1910 until 1914.

After World War I, Mr. Piccard was associated with the University of Lausanne, where he remained 2 years. From 1916 until 1919 he was on leave in the United States to serve as associate professor at the University of Chicago, where he met his wife, the former Jeannette Ridlon.

He was a research associate at Massachusetts Institute of Technology from 1926 until 1929. In 1931 he became a U.S. citizen.

Two years later, in collaboration with Auguste, he designed a stratosphere gondola, built at Midland, Mich. In 1934 he became a research associate of the Bartol Research Foundation, Swarthmore, Pa. That year he made a stratospheric flight from Detroit, Mich., to study cosmic rays.

JOINS 'U'

Mr. Piccard joined the University of Minnesota faculty in 1936 as a lecturer in the department of aeronautical engineering and remained with the department until his retirement in 1952.

In a flight made in 1934 with his wife, Mr. Piccard soared to an altitude of 57,559 feet during a 5-hour flight. He had made his first flight, with Auguste, in 1913.

In 1937 he made a test flight to an altitude of 11,000 feet over Rochester, Minn., using a metal gondola and 100 rubber latex balloons.

His son, Donald, made a flight from the Minneapolis parade grounds in 1947 to test a new gas valve designed by Mr. Piccard.

Donald, a resident of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., was in the Twin Cities at the time of his father's death. He had competed in the St. Paul Winter Carnival balloon races Sunday.

ONE OF 100

In 1950 Mr. Piccard was named one of Minnesota's 100 living great men. Edward R. Murrow brought his television crews to Minneapolis in 1957 to interview Mr. Piccard on "Person-to-Person."

Besides his widow, Jeannette, and his son, Donald, survivors include sons John, Wilmington, Del., and Paul, Tallahassee, Fla.; a sister, Madame Paul Rambert, Lausanne, Switzerland, and a brother, Dr. Paul Piccard, a retired justice of the Swiss Supreme Court, Lucerne, Switzerland.

Services will be at 10 a.m. Wednesday at St. Paul's Church on the Hill, Summit and Saratoga Avenues, St. Paul.

The family prefers memorials to the University of Minnesota or to St. Paul's Episcopal Day School, 1524 Summit Avenue, St. Paul.

[From American Men of Science, 1961]

DR. JEAN FELIX PICCARD

Specialty: Aeronautical engineering; organic chemistry.

Born in Basel, Switzerland, January 28, 1884; naturalized American citizen; married 1919; three children.

Diplomate, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, 1907; doctor of natural sciences, 1909; honorary doctor of science degrees awarded by Jamestown College, 1956, Southern Illinois University, 1959. P.D. in organic chemistry in Munich, Germany, in 1914; Lausanne, 1914-16; assistant professor, University of Chicago, 1916-18, associate professor, 1918-19; professor at Lausanne, 1919-25; research instructor, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; head, department of chemical services, Hercules Powder Co., 1929-32; stratosphere flying work, 1933-34; research associate, Bartol Research Foundation, 1934-36; special lecturer, aeronautical engineering, University of Minnesota, 1936-37; professor, 1937-52, emeritus professor,

1952 to date; civilian with U.S. Army Air Force, 1945.

Member of the following societies: American Chemical Society, American Meteorological Society, Society for Engineering Education, Aeronautics Association (awarded the certificate of merit, 1934), Geophysical Union, Institute of Aeronautical Sciences.

Principal areas of scientific research: Constitution and color of organic compounds; dissociation into free radicals of organic compounds as detected by color changes; Piccard effect; problems of aero engineering; design of plastic balloons.

COMMUNIST COUP IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on February 25, my distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] spoke some well-chosen words concerning the plight of the people of Czechoslovakia under Communist rule. In connection with the 15th anniversary of the Communist coup d'etat in Czechoslovakia, he caused to be printed in the RECORD a report compiled by the Czechoslovak National Council of America. I received a copy of this report and was deeply moved by its account of the economic and other sufferings of the great Czechoslovak people. The report plainly reveals that the self-appointed Communist authorities in Prague have no compunctions about extracting the utmost from their own subjects while cynically taking advantage of their privations in order to extort needed foreign exchange from American citizens.

It was my intention to join my colleague at that time in order to pay homage to the living spirit of Czech democracy—a spirit personified in the life and works of that great Czech and that great European, Thomas G. Masaryk. The Masaryk tradition was ably sustained by his successor Edward Benes and other liberal Czech nationalists. It was trampled underfoot by an unprincipled Communist minority in the dark days of February 24-26, 1948.

Owing to my necessary absence from the Senate on official business, Mr. President, I could not then pay tribute to the Czechoslovak people. Nevertheless, I wish at this time to acquaint Senators with a report, entitled "The Communist Coup D'Etat in Czechoslovakia," which was prepared at my request by Mr. Moorhead Wright III, of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. I asked for this report because in these troubled times it is instructive to have before us an example of the tactics employed by Communists in seizing power through so-called peaceful means. I suggest that the threatened governments of Latin America pay special attention to this report, because it should be borne in mind that the Czech coup took place even though all Red army troops had been withdrawn from Czech soil.

The Czech coup took place for a variety of reasons, including the strength of the national Communist Party, the fact that the government coalition was headed by a Communist, the widespread demoralization that followed Munich and the Nazi occupation, and the inability of the non-Communist majority to

thwart the will of the disciplined Communists and fellow travelers. Not all of these facts are brought out in Mr. Wright's report because I did not ask him for a thorough analysis of the situation. Nevertheless, I wish to call Senators' attention to them now, because the overthrow of Czech democracy is a classic model for Communist seizure of power through "democratic" or "parliamentary" processes. In this connection I call particular attention to the dire consequences that flow from the control of a country's Ministry of the Interior—or the government agency that controls the police—by the Communists. The result is the almost inevitable loss of authority by the duly constituted government. The police, the armed forces, the government—these are the three prime targets of a Moscow-supported Communist insurrection. If any Latin American, African, or Asian government feels safe with its central police force in Communist hands, let it ponder the experience of Czechoslovakia and other East European countries.

Mr. President, the Czech coup was responsible in large measure for the fact that we awoke to the postwar Communist threat. It shared this effect with the Greek civil war and Soviet demands on Turkey. It steered the West to resist Communist encroachments elsewhere. It was a major link in a chain of developments that led to the formation of NATO and to the creation of the hitherto unbroken solidarity of the West against Communist expansionism. How tragic that we had to learn this lesson at the expense of a small East European nation which had already suffered long years of totalitarian tyranny.

Free Czechoslovakia, Mr. President, shares our national spirit of industriousness and enterprise; it is imbued with the finest traditions of European humanism. It is pro-Western despite having ample reason for disillusionment with the West. In commemoration of the 15th anniversary of the extinguishment of freedom in Czechoslovakia, I ask unanimous consent that the above-mentioned report be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMUNIST COUP D'ETAT IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

The Communists were in a strong position in Czechoslovakia as early as 1945 when they gained a number of key ministries in the first postliberation cabinet. They controlled the Ministry of the Interior, which included the police; the Ministry of Agriculture, which was responsible for land reform and the distribution to peasants of land seized from Germans or collaborators; and the Ministries of Information and Education. The army and its leader, General Svoboda, came under Communist influence while undergoing training in the Soviet Union. The first Government was headed by the pro-Communist leader of the Social Democratic Party, Zdenek Fierlinger; after July 1946 the Prime Minister was Klement Gottwald, chairman of the Communist Party.

Although the Communists controlled the main power centers in the country, they continued to work within the limitations of popular front government. They sought to dominate the coalition by gaining control of

the Social Democratic Party and by dividing and weakening the other parties. The Social Democrats declared their intention to remain independent, however, and in November 1947 the leftwing Fierlinger was replaced by the independent-minded Lausman as party chairman. In addition, it became increasingly evident that the Communists' electoral position was weakening; a public opinion poll conducted by the Minister of Information predicted that the party would not do well in the general election in May 1948. The Communists thus had to turn to extra-constitutional methods to complete their takeover of Czechoslovakia.

The end of democratic government was also hastened by the deepening rift between Russia and the West. Czechoslovakia's foreign policy was traditionally pro-Russian, but she had important economic ties with the West. Stalin could not tolerate this bridge between the two camps, and in July 1947 he forced the Czech Government to decline an invitation to attend Marshall plan talks in Paris.

There was a permanent political crisis in the country from the summer of 1947 to February 1948 when the coalition government split, as the Communists hoped it would. The issue which caused the break was the Minister of the Interior's dismissal of eight police commissioners in Prague and their replacement by Communists. Since these commissioners controlled the police's arms supply, this was an ominous indication of the Communists' intentions. The other cabinet members balked at this move and passed a majority resolution on February 12 demanding that the eight commissioners be reinstated. The Minister of the Interior refused to obey the resolution and was backed by the Communist Prime Minister Gottwald. On February 21 the ministers belonging to three of the four non-Communist parties resigned in protest; the Social Democrats, who had voted for the resolution on the police issue, now hesitated to join the other parties in the resignation gesture. President Benes pledged not to accept the ministers' resignation and called for continuation of Popular Front government with all parties represented in the cabinet.

The Communists moved swiftly to insure their victory in the crisis. They armed detachments of factory workers and paraded them through the streets of Prague; on February 22, Gottwald addressed Communist mass trade-union demonstrations. The Minister of the Interior charged the National Socialist Party with plotting an armed revolt against the state and used this as a pretext for police seizure of party headquarters; also, a warrant was issued against Ursiny, leader of the Slovak Democrats, on charges of high treason. The left wing of the Social Democrats revolted against the party's middle-of-the-road leadership, seized control of party headquarters, and reinstated the pro-Communist Fierlinger as party head. The Communists silenced party and independent newspapers by force. "Action committees" headed by Communists took control of government ministries, local government councils and other organizations.

President Benes' resistance to Communist pressures gradually weakened; he was isolated and ill, and he wanted to avoid civil war and a break with the Soviet Union, which he considered the main defense against a revived Germany. Finally, on February 25 he gave in to the Communists' demands, accepting the resignation of the 12 ministers and authorizing Gottwald to set up a Communist-dominated cabinet. One of the few anti-Communist ministers in this new cabinet was Jan Masaryk, who continued to be Foreign Minister. But on March 10 his body was found in a courtyard of the Foreign Ministry. In Hugh Seton-Watson's words, "The death of this great

democrat, the last surviving male member of the family of the 'President-Liberator,' whose extraordinary charm and goodness had made him hundreds of devoted friends all over the world, especially in the Anglo-Saxon countries, brought home to the Czech people and to world opinion the horror of Czechoslovakia's tragedy."¹

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional 2 minutes in order to yield to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I commend the Senator from Minnesota for his very excellent statement on the lesson that is to be learned through the tragic experience of the Czechs and Slovaks having been taken over by the Communists.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator very much for his statement.

UKRAINIAN ARCHBISHOP SLIPIYI FREED AFTER 18-YEAR SOVIET IMPRISONMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on February 17, Archbishop Josyf Slipyi celebrated his 71st birthday. It was the first time in 18 years that the spiritual leader of Ukrainian Eastern-Rite Catholics had celebrated his birthday as a free man. Released last Christmas by the Kremlin, Archbishop Slipyi has become an inspiring symbol of the resistance of the Ukrainian faithful to the repressive measures of the atheistic Soviet regime.

Archbishop Slipyi was a distinguished scholar and rector of the Theological Academy in Lvov before he became Archbishop of Lvov in 1939. He became the leader of Ukrainian Eastern-Rite Catholics in 1944 when the great Metropolitan Andrew Sheptycki died under mysterious circumstances. Archbishop Slipyi became metropolitan shortly after the Soviets reoccupied the Ukraine. With the Soviet Union at war, the regime did not want to alienate the people's feelings, so the traditional Russian persecution of Ukrainian Eastern-Rite Catholics, which had been especially virulent in 1915 during World War I, was not immediately renewed. But soon the Soviets began to exert pressures on the metropolitan. At first they sought to enlist the church's help in stamping out partisan resistance to Soviet occupation in the Ukraine, but Archbishop Slipyi did not give in to this demand. Then the Soviets tried to force him to renounce all ties with the Holy See in Rome and place his communicants under the jurisdiction of the Kremlin-dominated Russian Orthodox Church. This the metropolitan also refused to do. On April 11, 1945, he was arrested with four other Ukrainian bishops. Eleven months later he was secretly tried and sentenced to 8 years' hard labor on false

charges of "traitorous activity and collaboration with the German occupation forces." None of the other bishops sentenced with him are still alive.

Although the details of his 18-year imprisonment are sketchy and often contradictory, it is apparent that the first 8 years of hard labor in a Siberian prison camp were the most arduous. The Soviets tortured him in a vain effort to make him embrace Russian orthodoxy. According to one report, he was confined with four Catholic priests in a small cell, where they said mass in secret using dried crusts of bread for the Host and using wine made from clandestinely fermented grapes and raisins. In 1954 he was allowed to return to Lvov, where he remained under house arrest without permission to exercise his priestly duties. He was tried and sentenced again, this time without any pretense of legality. At the time of his release in 1963 he was a servant in a Siberian old people's home.

It is extremely doubtful whether this gesture by the Kremlin presages an easing of religious persecution in the Soviet Union. Vatican officials view the archbishop's release as a simple act of personal respect by the Soviet Government for Pope John. The Vatican deserves the thanks of all freemen for whatever part its representatives may have played in arranging the archbishop's release. This act certainly offers a precedent for the release of other imprisoned religious leaders, such as Cardinal Mindszenty, who is a de facto prisoner in the American Legation at Budapest.

In the long run the release of Archbishop Slipyi should be viewed as a tactical shift rather than as a change in the Kremlin's basic attitude toward religion. It fits the general pattern of Khrushchev's substitution of relatively moderate methods of coercion for the brutal repressive measures which Stalin employed. The Communists may be learning gradually that religious faith thrives on persecution. In this context, Khrushchev's move can be interpreted as an act of enlightened self-interest, for as a living martyr, Archbishop Slipyi was a source of inspiration and courage for his flock.

While the release of Archbishop Slipyi is a joyful event, it does not in itself herald the return of religious freedom to the Soviet Union. There is strong evidence of increased efforts to curtail the practice of religion, which is one of the greatest threats to the totalitarian Communist regime. It is all the more urgent, therefore, that we strive unceasingly for the establishment of cultural autonomy—religious, educational, linguistic—in the Soviet Union. More than anything else, the "new Soviet man" of whom the Communists boast needs an inviolable bill of rights which emphasizes his freedom as an individual rather than his obligations as a cog in a machine. Unless such respect for basic human rights is introduced throughout the area under Soviet rule, Archbishop Slipyi's ordeal will have been in vain. His victory of faith and courage must guide us in this task.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain articles and press re-

¹ Hugh Seton-Watson, "The East European Revolution" (London: Methuen, 1950), p. 190.

ports relating to Archbishop Slipyi's arrest be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 11, 1963]

PRELATE FREED BY SOVIETS TELLS POPE OF TORTURE

VATICAN CITY, February 10.—The elderly head of Ukrainian Catholics told Pope John XXIII today how he survived 18 years of forced labor and horrible torture in Soviet prisons.

Msgr. Josyf Slipyi, who will be 71 next Sunday, met the Pope this morning for a lengthy audience.

Monsignor Slipyi, the metropolitan of Halyc and archbishop of Lvov, Soviet Ukraine, arrived in Rome last night and it was revealed that he had been released by the Russians last Christmas.

Monsignor Slipyi was first imprisoned April 11, 1945. He was one of 11 Ukrainian archbishops and bishops to be sentenced to various terms.

A number since have died—one by assassination—and Monsignor Slipyi is the first to be released.

A spokesman for the Ukrainian Pontifical College in Rome said that Monsignor Slipyi, head of Eastern rite Catholics in the Ukraine, "was horribly tortured and was forced to do hard labor in Siberia during his imprisonment."

The college spokesman said, "it is unlikely the metropolitan will discuss persecution in public because his every word could have a serious effect on thousands of people in the Ukraine."

Vatican sources said the archbishop's release "was not the result of an agreement between the Holy See and the Soviet Government, nor did the Holy See ask for it. There have been no negotiations on this matter."

The sources warned against believing Soviet persecution of the religious would be changed because of Monsignor Slipyi's release.

Pope John, during a cornerstone-laying ceremony for an Ambrosian seminary this morning, referred indirectly to Monsignor Slipyi's release.

"From the east of Europe there came yesterday evening a touching consolation, for which we thank the Lord," he said.

Monsignor Slipyi was charged with collaboration with the Germans at the time of his arrest. A booklet released by the Ukrainian college said this charge was based on the fact that his predecessor or Archbishop of Lvov had played host to German Army officers in the bishop's palace during the German occupation of the Ukraine.

It was not until 2 years later Moscow radio announced he had been sentenced to 8 years hard labor in Siberia. The Ukrainian college said he later was sentenced to two more terms of various lengths.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 13, 1963]

VATICAN GOT REIDS TO FREE ARCHBISHOP

VATICAN CITY, February 12.—The release of the imprisoned Archbishop of Lvov, Josyf Slipyi, from a Soviet forced-labor camp, was arranged under a Vatican ecumenical council program to ease points of friction between Roman Catholic and other churches, Vatican sources said today.

The release was engineered by the secretariat to promote Christian unity, which handles contacts with non-Catholic churches.

Monsignor Willebrands, member of the secretariat, brought the Ukrainian prelate back to Rome from Moscow by train after a visit there last week. On another mission to

Moscow, last fall, the monsignor arranged for the presence in Rome of two observers of the Russian Orthodox Church.

Vatican sources said the success of Monsignor Willebrands' two missions have considerably improved relations between the Catholic and Russian Orthodox Churches. The 70-year-old archbishop, who had been a Soviet prisoner for 18 years, arrived in Rome last Saturday.

The plan for the archbishop's release was evolved during the Vatican council last fall. Giacomo Cardinal Testa, secretary of the congregation for oriental rites, met the two Russian Orthodox observers and asked for a good-will gesture toward Archbishop Slipyi.

[From Time magazine, Feb. 22, 1963]

ROMAN CATHOLICISM: KREMLIN COOPERATION

Pope John XXIII, for all of his dislike for communism, is willing to be polite about it. Gone is the defiance that Pius XII used to hurl at the Kremlin; instead Rome makes such amicable gestures as inviting Russian Orthodox observers to the Vatican council. Last week the Pope produced in Rome a living gain from his policy of easing tensions: Ukrainian Archbishop Josyf Slipyi of Lvov, freed after 18 years of Soviet confinement.

The spiritual leader of the Ukraine's 2 million Byzantine-rite Catholics, tall, bearded Archbishop Slipyi, 71, is a Jesuit-trained theologian who was elevated to the episcopacy in 1939. Slipyi (pronounced sleep-pay) protested a postwar Russian attempt to force Byzantine-rite Ukrainians into the Russian Orthodox Church, and in 1946 was imprisoned, charged with "political crimes during the German occupation." Confined to a tiny cell with four Catholic priests, he said mass in secret, using dried crusts of bread for hosts and wine made by letting grapes and raisins ferment in a glass. In 1953, his hard-labor sentence was reduced to house arrest in Lvov, but 2 years later, Slipyi was shipped to a Siberian old people's home, where he was put to work as a servant.

MEETING WITH TWO RUSSIANS

Slipyi's release is the diplomatic handiwork of two close Curia friends of Pope John—Augustin Cardinal Bea, chief of the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, and Gustavo Cardinal Testa, secretary of the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church, which supervises Byzantine-rite Catholics. Late last November, Bea arranged a quiet meeting between Testa and the two Russian observers at the Vatican Council. Testa smoothly pointed out that the Pope had officially disavowed a protest prepared by a group of Ukrainian bishops at the council objecting to the presence of the Russians, tactfully brought up the subject of Archbishop Slipyi's long confinement. The Russians promised to do what they could, and last month notified Cardinal Bea that Slipyi would be freed. A fortnight ago, Bea's chief assistant, Dutch Msgr. Jan Willebrands, flew secretly to Moscow, escorted Slipyi by train to Vienna and then on to Rome. Slipyi had a personal audience with the Pope, has since been resting at the Byzantine-rite monastery of Grottaferata, 15 miles southeast of Rome. He hopes eventually to return to Lvov.

ONLY THE BEGINNING

The Vatican regards Slipyi's release as only the beginning. "This was a simple act of personal respect by the Russian Government for Pope John," says one Vatican official. "It also gives us hope that other negotiations will work out." There is little doubt as to who would be the subjects of other negotiations: Hungary's Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, a political refugee in the U.S. legation at Budapest since the 1956 uprising, and Archbishop Josef Beran of Prague, who was seized by Czech Communists in 1950, has not been heard from since.

PROPOSED CHANGE OF NAME OF HUNGRY HORSE DAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there has been speculation in the newspapers of my State—and I am quite sure I know from where that speculation comes—concerning the changing of the name of the reservoir formed by Hungry Horse Dam, known as Hungry Horse Lake, to Truman Lake or Truman Reservoir.

Mr. President, I am a great admirer of former President Harry Truman. I know he did a great deal to bring about the consummation of the project known as Hungry Horse. However, I believe in States' rights, to a certain extent, and I must say that I would not be in favor of changing the name of Hungry Horse Lake to Truman Lake, or to any other designation, with one exception.

Some years ago my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] and I introduced a bill to change the name of the reservoir behind Hungry Horse Dam to Harry Kelly Lake. We did so because Harry Kelly, who was long and favorably known as Hungry Horse Harry, fought for and worked for the Hungry Horse project long before anybody else in the Flathead area. Many times his was the lone voice in the wilderness—and I make that as a literal statement.

However, we were not successful in our endeavor to change the name.

I feel that, as a matter of State pride, if the name of Hungry Horse Harry Kelly is not to be attached to the lake, the name Hungry Horse Lake ought to be retained.

I am in full accord with a St. Louis Post-Dispatch editorial, which states in part:

Hungry Horse is one of our favorites—

It is one of mine, also, I say incidentally—

rich in flavor as a part of the Montana scene * * * in close harmony with the Old West of the Hungry Horse and the New West of hungry horsepower.

To that I say, "Amen."

Insofar as the dam is concerned, Mr. President, the present name should continue in the future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Great Falls Tribune of February 28, 1963, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HUNGRY HORSE DAM IT IS AND SO IT SHOULD REMAIN

We have admired former President Harry S. Truman. As President he supported and advanced water development projects in Montana and other Western States, but we are unalterably opposed to the proposal of congressional advocates to change the name of the reservoir formed by Hungry Horse Dam to Lake Truman.

This is included in a list of dams and reservoirs for which name changes are being sought to honor former Presidents and Senators. The effort to make the nauseous pill more palatable by splitting the name between reservoir and dam only compounds the felony and confuses one and all.

If a personal name were fitting for the Hungry Horse layout, none other would be

so deserving of the honor as the late Harry J. Kelly, pioneer Montana newspaperman and longtime Kallispell weekly publisher. He was the first champion of Hungry Horse Dam—at a time when supporters were scarce and scoffers numerous. He began his crusade of editorials and speeches in support of the project in 1933 and continued it until 1944, when Congress approved the Bureau of Reclamation plans. He gained the nickname of "Hungry Horse Harry" and earned the title of "Father of Hungry Horse Dam."

It is not surprising that a few years ago a proposal to designate the reservoir Kelly Lake was supported by the Montana congressional delegation. We were not in favor of that despite Kelly's qualification for the honor.

A St. Louis Dispatch editorial hit the nail on the head when it said: "Hungry Horse is one of our favorites—rich in flavor as a part of the Montana scene * * * in close harmony with the Old West of the Hungry Horse and the New West of hungry horsepower."

There is a lot of interesting legend attached to the name Hungry Horse. We should cultivate and preserve it instead of trying to water it down.

FREE WORLD TRADE WITH CUBA

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, during the past 2 or 3 weeks, at various intervals, I have placed in the RECORD the names of free world ships engaging in Cuban trade. These names have been received on the basis of facts supplied by the Defense Department and the Maritime Administration, as well as other reliable sources of information. All the names have been placed in the RECORD, giving the flag under which the ships sail as well as the number of ships involved.

Mr. President, some ships are still engaging in trade with Cuba, and the number is greater than many people realize.

A dispatch to the Baltimore Sun, published in the February 19 issue of that paper, reported that eight ships flying flags of countries outside the Communist bloc were sighted by crewmen of the U.S.-flag freighter *SS Santo Cerro* during the 3 days that vessel was in a Cuban port, discharging its cargo of ransom medicines, drugs, and baby foods.

Three of the vessels reported seen by the crewmen were of British registry, three flew the Greek flag, one was Norwegian, and the other Yugoslavian. Together with the dozen or more additional freighters from Communist countries observed by the U.S. crewmen there were thus 20 or more ocean freighters in that Cuban port in the 3-day period cited. They represented a total freight carrying capacity which, if maintained with any degree of regularity, would go far toward taking care of a great proportion of Cuba's food and other requirements.

I ask unanimous consent that the Baltimore Sun article be printed in the RECORD in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREE-WORLD SHIPS SEEN IN HAVANA—EIGHT NOTICED DURING 3 DAYS RANSOM VESSEL WAS THERE

WASHINGTON, February 18.—Eight free world ships were in Havana harbor during

the 3 days the last ransom-bearing American-flag freighter, the *SS Santo Cerro*, was there, it was learned today.

This number in such a short period of time is considered significant, because the Kennedy administration pointed out that since only 15 free world ships had called at Cuba during the entire month of January, stringent regulations were not necessary against trading with Cuba.

Therefore, the administration's only restriction was to prevent vessels calling at Cuba since January 1 from loading U.S. Government-owned and financed cargo at U.S. ports, but not at foreign ports.

SEEN BY CREW

Seen by the crewmembers of the *Santo Cerro* from February 10 to February 13 were three British vessels, three Greek, one Norwegian, and one Yugoslav. In addition to these free world ships, they saw 10 Russian and several East German vessels. No mention of Poland was made.

The *Santo Cerro* carried the third shipload of ransom medical supplies, drugs, and baby foods demanded by Premier Fidel Castro in exchange for the 1,113 released Bay of Pigs prisoners.

The American-flag *Santo Cerro* loaded in Baltimore and sailed February 7. Her cargo brought up to \$25 million the total sent to Cuba. The full ransom is \$53 million.

The fourth ship is to be the German-flag *Priamos*, made available by the Standard Fruit Co. for loading at New Orleans beginning Thursday. The ship sails regularly from New Orleans.

NO REFUGEES EXPECTED

The *Priamos* is to load 2,300 tons valued at \$1,100,000. She is not expected to bring back any refugees, the American Red Cross said, because she will head directly from Havana for Costa Rica to pick up bananas.

Like the *Santo Cerro*, the *Priamos* is a refrigerated vessel.

The 3,027-gross-ton German freighter will be the first of the four to load at a gulf port. The first—the *SS African Pilot*—took on her \$11 million cargo at Port Everglades. The *Shirley Lykes* and the *Santo Cerro* loaded at Baltimore.

H.D.B.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have been placing the list in the RECORD from time to time, in the hope that the efforts of the President of the United States and of the State Department—to have the countries involved voluntarily prohibit their ships from moving in and out of Cuba, at the risk of losing their cargoes—can succeed, and so that the economic quarantine or shipping quarantine will be actually such.

On February 7, I published another list in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In that list I mentioned the names of ships, and included in the list was that of a Swedish vessel, the *Cooranga*. Upon learning of this, the owner of the ship contacted the Ministry for Foreign Affairs at Stockholm and reported that the inclusion of the *Cooranga* in the list was incorrect, and asked rectification of that error. We have checked on that. Apparently the Maritime Commission, in the case of this one ship among many, listed it erroneously, and the following day I submitted a corrected list.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter to me, together with a list of the ships referred to.

There being no objection, the letter and list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROYAL SWEDISH EMBASSY,

Washington, February 13, 1963.

The Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: On page 2057 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, of February 7, 1963, a list has been reproduced at your request on free world ship arrivals in Cuba, January 1-31, 1963. In this connection, may I draw your attention to the following:

Among the names of ships listed that of a Swedish vessel, the *Cooranga*, occurs. Upon learning this the owners of the ship in question contacted the Ministry for Foreign Affairs in Stockholm, reporting that the inclusion of the *Cooranga* in the list was incorrect and requesting a rectification. On instructions from Stockholm, my Embassy contacted the U.S. authorities concerned, conveying to them the information received from the shipping line. They immediately confirmed that the listing was erroneous, and the following day issued a corrected list, a copy of which I enclose herewith for your ready reference.

Against the background of the above facts, I would very much appreciate if you could kindly have the RECORD corrected on this point.

Sincerely yours,

GUNNAR JARRING,
Ambassador of Sweden.

REVISED LIST OF FREE WORLD SHIP ARRIVALS IN CUBA, JANUARY 1-31, 1963

NAME OF SHIP—FLAG OF REGISTRY

1. *Arlington Court* (British).
2. *Cannaregio* (Italian).
3. *Capetan Petros* (Greek).
4. *Gloria* (Greek).
5. *London Confidence* (tanker) (British).
6. *London Splendour* (tanker) (British).
7. *Meishun Maru* (Japanese).
8. *Mousse* (Lebanese).
9. *Overseas Pioneer* (tanker) (British).
10. *Pampas* (British).
11. *Perseus* (tanker) (Greek).
12. *Redestos* (Greek).

NOTE.—The *Cooranga* (Swedish) and the *Freedom First* (Panamanian) were carried on a previous listing as having called at Cuba between January 1-31, 1963. More complete information now available discloses these two ships did not call at Cuba during the period indicated.

(Prepared by Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.)

NOMINATION OF PHILIP N. BROWNSTEIN TO BE FEDERAL HOUSING COMMISSIONER

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement concerning the nomination of Philip N. Brownstein, of Maryland, to be Federal Housing Commissioner. This nomination was confirmed by the Senate on Friday last.

The nomination of this distinguished citizen has met with enthusiastic approval by Representatives in Congress, as well as by members of the financial community.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a number of letters from Members of Congress and others in tribute to Mr. Brownstein and in support of this excellent nomination.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 4, 1963.

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I was pleased to learn of President Kennedy's recent nomination of Mr. Philip N. Brownstein for Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration.

Mr. Brownstein's experience in the housing field eminently qualifies him for this appointment, and I am happy to advise you of my support for his confirmation.

With best personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE A. SMATHERS.

JANUARY 22, 1963.

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: Your committee will soon be holding a hearing on the question of confirming Philip N. Brownstein, whom the President has nominated to be Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration.

I hope your committee will recommend Mr. Brownstein's confirmation.

In my judgment, no better choice could have been made. He is an outstanding civil servant, possesses both a keen mind and mature judgment, and his long experience with both the FHA and VA loan programs has eminently qualified him for the post.

Sincerely,

ALBERT RAINS,
Chairman.

JANUARY 23, 1963.

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I was very pleased to read of the pending appointment of Philip Brownstein as head of the Federal Housing Administration.

Mr. Brownstein has had a distinguished career in Government service and I believe is ably fitted for this position. He enjoys the confidence and respect of leaders in the housing industry and I believe his confirmation would meet with overwhelming approval.

This appears to be an excellent appointment of an outstanding public servant.

Very best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. WIDNALL.

JANUARY 24, 1963.

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: May I say a few words to you and your distinguished colleagues on behalf of Phil Brownstein whose confirmation as Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration is pending before you.

Not that I think Phil needs them, but it gives me great pleasure, based upon years of association with him, to give you my personal estimate of him. At all times, I have found him to be a man of excellent conduct and manners and a man of exceptional ability—also, he is a tremendous organizer and most levelheaded.

He will do an outstanding job for the good of the country and the agency as Commissioner of FHA. I hope you will confirm him.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes, I am

Respectfully yours,

ALBERT THOMAS.

FEBRUARY 11, 1963.

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Several weeks ago the appointment of Mr. P. N. Brownstein, now the Chief Benefits Director of the Veterans' Administration, to be the new Federal Housing Administration Commissioner, was made.

Mr. Brownstein has done an outstanding job as Chief Benefits Director of the Veterans' Administration and in that capacity he has been responsible for directing a variety of Veterans' Administration programs costing several billion dollars a year. As part of his responsibility he was charged with supervision and operation of all Veterans' Administration regional offices.

We regret very much losing Mr. Brownstein from the Veterans' Administration program but I did wish to express to you the belief you are getting a good man for the Federal Housing Administration. I believe that you will find him able and cooperative.

Sincerely,

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman.

JANUARY 22, 1963.

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am taking the liberty of communicating with you in support of the nomination of Mr. Philip N. Brownstein as Federal Housing Commissioner.

I know Mr. Brownstein personally and can commend him to you as one who would creditably discharge any duties imposed upon him. His background and experience eminently qualify him for the position of Federal Housing Commissioner, and it is my hope that your committee will consider his nomination favorably.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

EUGENE J. KEOGH.

JANUARY 15, 1963.

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: As a former Commissioner of FHA I wish to express to you my great pleasure in learning that President Kennedy has appointed Philip N. Brownstein to be Commissioner of FHA subject to Senate confirmation.

During a good part of my 20-year tenure with FHA I was privileged to work closely with "Phil" on many matters arising from our efforts to coordinate the housing activities of FHA and VA.

On these occasions I was always greatly impressed with his good judgment and outstanding administrative ability.

I am sure that you will find in him the same high qualities that I have so long recognized.

Cordially,

WALTER L. GREENE,
Vice President.

JANUARY 22, 1963.

Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR WILLIS: A recent Richmond newspaper mentioned the possibility of Philip Brownstein being appointed as Federal Housing Commissioner.

I have been acquainted with Mr. Brownstein for a number of years and hold him in highest regard. His 25 years experience in this field and his other qualifications make him an excellent choice. Your support of him would be appreciated.

Sorry you cannot make the United States League reception Tuesday night. Hope to see you before too long.

Sincerely,

MARK W. SAURS,
Executive Vice President.

JANUARY 22, 1963.

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: I would like to take this opportunity to convey to you my support for the President's nomination of Philip N. Brownstein to be the new Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration.

I have known Mr. Brownstein for many years and have found him to always be objective, understanding, and extremely capable. His many years of experience in the housing field eminently qualify him to be the FHA Commissioner, and I was delighted to learn of his appointment.

Naturally, I hope that your committee can quickly and favorably recommend his confirmation as Commissioner, and I wanted you to know that I have never heard anyone question Mr. Brownstein's ability to do this job as one of the top Government officials in the housing field.

Sincerely,

HENRY A. BUBB,
Chairman, Legislative Committee.

SELECTION OF OFFICERS FOR THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point an article entitled "Are We Getting Our Share of the Best?" written by R. Smith Simpson, and published in the Foreign Service Journal for November 1962. The article relates to one of the most critical questions confronting our foreign service in the country. I commend it to the interest of all my colleagues.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARE WE GETTING OUR SHARE OF THE BEST? (By R. Smith Simpson)

The process of finding and selecting officers adequately equipped for our diplomatic service is a singularly exacting one keyed to highly selective criteria. It has been developed by trial and error over a number of years, subjected to numerous reappraisals, exposed to various essays of experimentation. One would be justified in expecting it would bring into the Foreign Service a flow of superbly qualified young men and women, the pick of their generation—young men and women fully aware of the importance of the calling to which they aspired and at least moderately well prepared for its opportunities and obligations of representing the United States abroad.

A year of service as a deputy examiner engaged in interviewing candidates and a round of colleges as a part of the Department's recruiting effort have persuaded me that accomplishment falls grievously short of the ideal. Of those candidates I examined a few were good, a rare one was outstanding, but the great majority were wholly unprepared for diplomatic work, and did not even have the slightest glimmer of what it was. Somehow they had acquired a feeling they might like the Foreign Service, or at any rate it would do no harm to give the examinations a whirl to see "what gives." They had no conception whatever that this

is an exacting calling, involving not only considerable hazard and adventure but also a profound cultural awareness, knowledge of history and political science, some familiarity with the behavioral sciences and at least an elementary grounding in international law, international organization and diplomacy—in other words considerable intellectual preparation, if they are adequately to represent their country abroad.

My initial surprise was to find among the candidates an abysmal ignorance of so elementary a subject as the geography of the United States. Few could even place accurately the principal rivers: one with so descriptive a name as the Ohio was not infrequently identified as being "somewhere west of the Mississippi." Few could name the principal seaports, and, of course, any requirement demanding such detailed familiarity with this country as identifying the States comprising the Wheat Belt or the Corn Belt was completely beyond the average candidate's depth.

As to elementary economics and social data, most could only guess at the population, labor force, and gross national product of their country. Many did not know what constituted "gross national product." They had no clear idea as to the principal products of their country, nor as to its exports and imports. They could name a few of each, but had no notion of their relative importance and had given no thought to the role of imports in the American economy.

As with elementary geographic and economic aspects of the United States, so with historical, sociological, and cultural. Americans abroad are asked a great many questions about their country. How did the United States acquire the Panama Canal? What is its status now? Who started our war with Spain (or Mexico) and what came out of it? When did our labor movement start and where does it stand now? How does a Jimmy Hoffa get control of a powerful union? What were some of the reform movements in American history? What became of them?

A good half of our candidates could answer such questions with only the thinnest recital of facts; many could not discuss them at all. Some could not recall ever having heard of the Populist movement; few knew its connection with Woodrow Wilson's New Freedom. Asked if he knew anything about the progressive movement, one candidate replied, "Oh, yes, that was LaFollette's movement." To the question, "Where did LaFollette come from?" he could only reply vaguely, "Somewhere out west."

I would say that the proportion of candidates who could handle current events questions reasonably well was about 6 out of 10. Perhaps three or four could give fairly adequate definitions of the Truman Doctrine or the Eisenhower Doctrine, even state the composition and responsibilities of SEATO and CENTO. Most of them had never heard of ANZUS.

If we explored American foreign policy we encountered baffling deficiencies. Most of them knew the origin of the Monroe Doctrine and its general content, but beyond that their knowledge rapidly petered out. The tests the Doctrine has undergone, the various interpretations placed on it, its abuses were beyond them. Naturally, we rarely ventured to ask for a discussion of whether it is still in existence; although this is a question many of them will encounter and all of them should be expected to handle with some degree of information and intelligence.

The American abroad is asked about American culture as often as about our history, our politics and our policies. An Indian dinner guest may inquire: "America is very materialistic, I understand. Is that so? What has it contributed to cultural and spiritual progress?" No more than 1 can-

didate in 20 could provide a thoughtful, well-informed response to such a question. Even sadder to relate, they were equally blank on purely factual questions. Could the candidate give his Indian guests the names of five or six American painters and tell something of their work? The names of five composers? Of two or three philosophers? Of a few poets, novelists or essayists other than the contemporaries with whom the Indian was probably familiar?

The answers were halting and feeble. Many could not name a single painter, a single composer, a single philosopher, other than contemporary. Even in the literary field knowledge was surprisingly limited. Thought-provoking questions, requiring a certain amount of relating and synthesizing—"What has been Chicago's contribution to American literature?" for example—left them gaping and stumbling. We put simpler factual questions: What was the New England school of literature in the 19th century? We found college graduates native to New England itself who could not answer.

Most candidates showed some slight familiarity with 20th century writers. Asked to name some poets, they almost invariably led off with Robert Frost. Among novelists, they could produce the names of Hemingway and Faulkner, perhaps others. (One mentioned Tennessee Williams.) But under questioning this familiarity proved to be shallow; it did not survive much discussion.

Questions of a sociological nature asked us abroad and on which we should be able to throw intelligent light found candidates pitifully uninformed. Such questions concern the basis and nature of our society. They are problems people confront abroad. They raise doubts of our fitness for leadership. What are the causes of our sizable problem of juvenile delinquency? What are the causes of our high divorce rate? Why do we permit trashy pulp magazines to exist, to be exported? Why Hollywood? To what extent are our basic civil rights effective? Rare indeed was the candidate who could cope with such questions.

As to diplomacy itself, few of the candidates had any idea what it was. Nine out of ten had not even given any thought to it, it never having occurred to them to so much as look the word up in a dictionary, much less go to a library and read something about it, if only a biography or two. This was baffling indeed. I had expected to find far greater interest in a profession which candidates were considering as a career. I had expected, even, preparation, but as to this I found our universities deficient. One has to search far and wide for a course in diplomacy, particularly one in which its methods and techniques are discussed. Our universities appear to be hypnotized by the machinery and formulation of foreign policy: consideration of its execution is well-nigh nonexistent.

Indeed, one conclusion that emerges from such an experience as this is that American education is letting us down. An educational system that turns out graduates lacking the simplest geographical and sociological knowledge about their country is not an adequate educational system. Universities that graduate men and women with only a smattering of knowledge of their Nation's history, its governmental structure and political system, and its cultural evolution as well as of the international political system, do not merit the name of universities.

Unless the quality of our education is even more appalling than I think it is, a second conclusion must be that the State Department and the Foreign Service are no longer getting their share of the cream of college graduates.

One reason for this is that the Foreign Service is no longer the principal avenue for dedication to constructive work abroad.

The spirit of service now has a score of outlets to two or three existing 30 years ago. Philanthropic and charitable organizations with overseas programs have multiplied, and broadened their activities. Three thousand American companies now operate outside the United States and offer all kinds of opportunities, including negotiation of agreements with foreign governments and the development of exchange, training and technical assistance programs, in a private diplomacy very similar in content to public.

The competition of the professions is more formidable than ever. Teaching now offers many opportunities for travel and cross-cultural adventure through scholarships and fellowships, exchange programs, foundation grants, positions in overseas branches. Law schools send moot court teams to college to demonstrate the practice of law and attract promising undergraduates. The physical sciences have taken on new glamour; there is a widespread feeling that our country's destiny lies in the hands of the scientists. Space technology has the adventuresome appeal that diplomacy had 30 years ago and the financial rewards are much greater.

The competition is not only from this extensive area of private and semipublic enterprise, but from other components of the Federal establishment. There are few departments and agencies not engaged in foreign affairs in some manner. They also have taken to offering summer employment as a means of stimulating interest. The military services offer many opportunities which parallel the Foreign Service, with fringe benefits our Service does not provide.

Impairing the competitive position of the Foreign Service is also the fact that in recent years it has become somewhat less of a foreign service than formerly. We can no longer offer the virtual certainty that a recruit will spend extended periods of his life abroad, with diversity of life, work, travel and adventure that this means. Since Wristonization, officers must expect to spend sizable periods of their careers right here at home.

The barrage of criticism directed at the Department and the Service has discouraged some applicants. I had candidate after candidate attest to this and query me about the criticism. It seems quite evident that we must be prepared to discuss criticism frankly, conceding deficiencies and mistakes where they exist, pointing convincingly to our achievements, although these may be quiet and unobtrusive, presenting clearly the difficulties and problems confronting the practice of diplomacy in this age.

For this complex of reasons, we are not now achieving the high level of quality the times require and which was envisioned by the various committees which, in the last 15 years, have examined the Foreign Service and made recommendations for its improvement. "Foreign policy," said the Wriston committee, "will be dynamic or inert, steadfast or aimless, in proportion to the character and unity of those who serve it."¹ Formal unit we have achieved, but character we have neglected.

In addition, since World War II, we have achieved the establishment of a broader base for recruitment. Our candidates now come from all parts of the country, all income levels, all social environments, all occupational backgrounds, all types of schools and almost every racial and national origin. But the Department has not correspondingly extended its effort at quality recruitment. It has followed the letter of the recommendation that the Nation's diplomatic service be more representative without recognizing the ancillary necessity of refining its competitive

¹ Toward a Stronger Foreign Service. Report of the Secretary of State's Public Committee on Personnel, June 1954. Department of State Publication 5458. U.S. Government Printing Office.

appeal to achieve a reservoir of suitable quality. It has not offered to college students or faculties a clear enough image of the Service and the kind of people it seeks. It has not set forth either the educational preparation needed nor, clearly and precisely enough, the personal qualifications, aptitudes and skills. It has engaged in a dragnet, come-one-come-all operation. If quality is to be combined with representativeness in our reservoir of talent, a greater effort—qualitative, in particular—is required.

To get across to our colleges, and even to our secondary schools, and the general public, a clearer image of our diplomatic service and the kind of people who can qualify is, I suggest, a fundamental responsibility of the department of foreign affairs in a democracy and it is going to take some doing. It requires, first, a clearer and deeper analysis of diplomacy. The content and techniques of our work rather than its situs abroad must now be emphasized. What is required is (1) a clearer concept among ourselves of what diplomacy is today—which is to say, the different types of diplomacy which the current environment exacts; (2) a clearer analysis of the competitive factors we are up against, including the interests of young people and why they have these interests, in order that our presentation may be sharply pitched to these interests; and (3) a more discriminating selection of the Foreign Service officers assigned to present the Service and its requirements to our educational system and the public, and the assignment of such officers for long enough periods to provide continuity of contact, experience and effort.

We must be quite clear and very determined about this. We can no longer afford the luxury of letting the Department and the Service be represented by officers who are not sufficiently seasoned and intellectually responsive to their audiences. Let me give an example or two of what I mean. Some high school teachers who had attended one of the Department's seminars complained to me afterward that the Department's presentation was incomplete and evasive. I pointed out that naturally there were matters that could not be placed on the top of a seminar table for public discussion. That was not the kind of thing the teachers had in mind, however. They were referring instead to such instances as the reply of a senior Foreign Service officer who, when asked what kind of informational program the United States had in the area under discussion, told the questioner he would have to get his answer from USIA. No one in the seminar felt that this was satisfactory or reassuring as to the Department's familiarity with, much less coordination of, our total diplomacy.

Another example is directly related to our recruiting effort. Representatives of the Department and of another Federal agency visited a certain eastern college for recruiting purposes. The other agency sent its deputy director; the Department's representative was a junior Foreign Service officer. Among the dozen or so students who showed up at the Department's meeting were the sons of a Foreign Service colleague. They described the Department's spokesman as timid, evasive, and inadequately informed on the current crises facing the United States. By contrast, the agency representative impressed the students as mature, frank, responsive, and well informed. No more than two or three students showed any further interest in the Foreign Service, but a dozen or so filled out applications to the other agency.

I would warn against any superficial or merely bureaucratic effort to improve our communication with the educational establishment and the general public. This is not something that can be handed out to officers as a kind of recruitment patter. It is not a matter of visiting more campuses

or staying longer. What is needed is a clearer conceptualization of diplomacy in the 20th century and this can come only from the minds of the officers themselves. We must take a more analytical—let us say a more scientific—interest in the overall nature of our policymaking and diplomatic functions, and the way in which these fit into the work of other departments, other agencies, private firms, universities. We must be willing to examine our work critically, pinpointing its deficiencies as well as its excellence, its failures as well as its achievements, and ask ourselves why these deficiencies and failures occur. We must familiarize ourselves with the growing literature on foreign policy and operations and the wide range of sociological factors involved.

The Department on its side must be prepared to take steps to stimulate and make possible such an intellectual effort. This means, for one thing, that the Department and the Service must be staffed generously enough to provide time for intellectual, as contrasted with routine, day-to-day effort. Officers so hard pressed by daily demands that they can scarcely keep up with a good daily newspaper will not be able to measure up to what is required.

If this effort can be made, one consequence will be to bring us into closer relationships with our colleges and universities. The thinking of the faculties of our higher institutions of learning can help us in our search for clarification; we in turn have something to offer them. From this exchange will come a clearer understanding, on the campus and among ourselves, of the kind of work in which we are engaged and the kind of people we are seeking.

As the Wriston Committee said: "No segment of the Foreign Service machinery stands in more pressing need of modernization than its recruitment of junior officers." But no tinkering and tampering will produce this modernization. It must take place in the minds of men.

GENERAL EISENHOWER'S MARKSMANSHIP IN MEXICO AND THE BIRD POPULATION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a small news item in the Washington Evening Star last Monday caught my eye. It was a very sketchy report of a highly successful bird hunting excursion enjoyed by General Eisenhower in Mexico. According to the report, General Eisenhower killed 40 ducks and 35 other birds in a period of less than 3 hours last Saturday.

This is certainly a testimonial to General Eisenhower's keen marksmanship, but I shudder to think what the grand total would have been if he had made a full day of it. I do not know how many were in his party, but it is obvious that if their eyesight was as keen as the general's, the duck population has incurred a serious setback.

I do not believe that Arkansas duck hunters would necessarily be impressed with the general's marksmanship. We have some mighty good hunters in Arkansas too, but they have little opportunity to test their skill under the same circumstances, since last season they were limited to only one mallard a day. Duck hunting has traditionally been excellent in Arkansas and it has in the past contributed a great deal to our economy by attracting thousands of out-of-State sportsmen. With a bag limit of only one mallard a day, however,

there is not much incentive for someone to travel a considerable distance to merely watch the ducks fly over. If they could shoot all the ducks they wanted, I daresay that they could equal the general's record but, of course, there would not be any ducks at all the next year.

Two years ago the Congress authorized what is in effect a crash program to try to halt the decline in the duck population by speeding up the purchase of good breeding and nesting lands. This was a bipartisan program which encountered little, if any, opposition in the Congress. The question was not whether or not to authorize the conservation program but rather how fast to carry it out. Seven million dollars was appropriated by the Congress last year as the initial increment in the purchase program and \$12 million has been requested by the President for the next fiscal year. We have been working with our Canadian friends in an effort to improve the waterfowl situation at that end of the flyway. Neither the wetlands acquisition program nor the efforts to solve the breeding problem in Canada will accomplish much if the ducks and geese are all decimated at the wintering end of the flyway.

General Eisenhower's reputation as a marksman may have been improved by this recent hunt, but I fear that it does not lend much encouragement to our wildlife officials who are trying so hard to improve the waterfowl situation. I hope that all U.S. hunters visiting in Mexico do not follow the General's example.

I ask unanimous consent that the newspaper article to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EISENHOWER SHOOTS 75 BIRDS IN MEXICO
CULIACAN, MEXICO, February 25.—Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower's marksmanship is still hot. And so is his appetite while on vacation at nearby Las Cruces.

The former President went duck hunting here and killed 40 ducks and 35 other birds in less than 3 hours Saturday. Then he rolled his own tacos, a sort of Mexican sandwich made of tortillas, and enjoyed chile con carne and enchiladas.

GOLD MEDAL FOR EDDIE CANTOR

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on Monday, February 18, 1963, my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], introduced Senate Joint Resolution 47, which would authorize the President of the United States to express the high esteem and appreciation of the American people, and the issuance of a gold medal to Eddie Cantor.

The Senator from Florida has done this country a great service in calling to our attention the need for recognizing this outstanding humanitarian and entertainer, who not only has devoted his life to entertain Americans via radio, television, the motion picture, and stage, but also has given of his time to help in many worthy causes, the most notable of which is probably the March of Dimes,

the 25th anniversary of which we celebrate this year.

Because it was the beloved Mr. Cantor who 25 years ago suggested to President Franklin D. Roosevelt the idea of every American interested in combating poliomyelitis to send 10 cents to the White House—the idea of a March of Dimes was created. It has stood the test of time—and because of it and through it, this dread disease today has virtually been stopped.

And even though the March of Dimes has virtually eradicated polio, the work of this great organization still goes on seeking cures, through research, of other crippling diseases.

Knowing that Mr. Cantor is a modest man, his recognition is symbolic of all Americans who have given so unselfishly and untiringly of their services to this great humanitarian effort.

The Senator from Florida has asked the Congress to act promptly and favorably on this resolution. I join with my distinguished colleague from Florida in this request, and particularly urge the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, to which this resolution was referred, to move with dispatch.

The junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] has assisted us all in putting this overall resolution in its proper perspective when he said that for the Congress to recognize Mr. Cantor through issuance of this gold medal, we are recognizing not only a fellow man who is a national figure, but a man who is a national asset.

FEDERAL AID TO CITIES

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, as a Member of a body directly concerned with the operations of the Federal Government I have many times heard the accusation that the Federal Government is a bureaucratic octopus continually seeking involvement in more and more areas of government.

I am convinced that the Federal Government is involved in a great many areas of concern primarily because there was a job to do and no one else would do it. It often appears that when there is a vacuum of responsibility the only level of government with the interest and ability to fill that vacuum is the Federal.

I for one would certainly be glad to see State and local units of government assume more responsibility. But I cannot believe that needed programs and services should be abandoned if no one at the local level will carry them out.

This problem is very well put in perspective in a recent editorial in a fine weekly newspaper in Wyoming, the Kemmerer Gazette. This editorial points out that the same people who are so vocal in condemning the Federal Government for moving into governmental vacuums are the same people who help create those vacuums by inaction at the local level.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOWARD FEDERAL AID

It is hardly surprising that the State legislature flatly refused to give Wyoming cities and towns badly needed additional revenue. The State legislature, through the years, has never been particularly responsive to the needs of the citizens of Wyoming's rapidly growing municipalities.

The legislature's refusal to act was, however, extremely disappointing because it appeared as late as a week before adjournment that the cities and towns would get more revenue.

The sales tax measure (of which the towns would have gotten only one-fourth) passed the house of representatives by a substantial margin. The disappointment came when the senate defeated the measure by nearly a two to one majority.

Even if the lawmakers didn't like the sales tax, however, they could have passed any one of a number of alternative revenue-producing bills sponsored by the Wyoming Association of Municipalities. But they chose not to.

Thus, once again, the cities and towns get nothing.

There is one ironic, almost ridiculous, aspect about this situation. This comes in the fact that several of the most influential legislators like to speak long and loud in criticism of Federal aid.

By their act of denying cities and towns State revenue, the legislators are forcing the municipalities to seek aid from the Federal Government.

A good case in point is near at hand. A new bill has been introduced into the U.S. Congress which would appropriate \$100 million to aid cities in eliminating combined sanitary and storm sewers.

Does this strike a familiar chord?

The town of Kemmerer has combination sanitary-storm sewers. The matter has been under discussion recently. The city council would like to separate the two sewer systems if money were available to do the job. Many other cities and towns, some of them in Wyoming, have the same problem.

The Federal Government is working on a solution to these problems. Our State government, through the lack of action by its legislature, has ignored these problems.

In the next few years, the Federal Government will move into many fields which were formerly considered the province of local government. One of the chief reasons for this will be the failure to solve problems by local government.

Wyoming's State legislature has boosted the cities and towns another step along the way to becoming dependent on the Federal Government.

PEACE CORPS TRAGEDY

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I was informed yesterday that the bodies of two members of the Peace Corps were found in the wreckage of an airliner which crashed yesterday in the Philippines. The two were Phillip Maggard, of Buffalo, Wyo., and Nancy Ann Boyd, of Martinez, Calif.

There is little anyone can say or do to lessen the heartbreak of a tragedy like this one. These young people with their enthusiasm for life and their concern for their fellow man are gone. We can only say to their parents, their relatives and friends, that we too share your grief.

These deaths have illustrated a sad fact of human nature, that it is the bold,

the daring, who pay the price for the advancement of mankind. Whether it be the pioneer extending the boundaries of civilization or the Peace Corpsman fighting the forces of want and suffering, it is those who live their convictions, who are not afraid to venture into unknown or dangerous fields who make the sacrifice for progress.

The Peace Corps is to me patriotism of the highest order. It is an endeavor that calls upon the very best in the human spirit and the very finest in the American traditions. These two young people exemplified the spirit of this Nation and the Peace Corps. We suffer because of their deaths; the world and the cause of freedom suffers a loss, yet at the same time the world is a better place because they were here.

Mr. President, the dedication of members of the Peace Corps is superbly illustrated by a statement made by Phillip Maggard in his application to join that group. Phillip, who hoped someday to be a minister, wrote:

Since my ministry would be concerned mainly with attempts to help humanity, I feel the Peace Corps would provide a way of gaining experience that would make that attempt more feasible. And, having worked with the Peace Corps, I should hope to feel that I have left my area better than I had found it.

Phillip Maggard was 22 years old; he attended the University of the South at Sewanee, Tenn., and the University of Wyoming at Laramie. He entered Peace Corps training last June at San Jose State College in California and was a member of the Seventh Peace Corps contingent sent to the Philippines. At the time of his death he was teaching at a small village school in Liangu Bay, Agusan Province on the isle of Mindanao. His father, J. M. Maggard, is superintendent of schools in Buffalo, Wyo. Members of the family have long been friends of mine.

Mr. President, there are always many mundane details that attend tragedies such as this one and I am gratified to know that Sargent Shriver, Director of the Peace Corps, has been able to send one of his assistants, Nathaniel Davis, to Buffalo to relieve the family of as much of this detail as is possible.

Mr. President, I should like to include the following statements from persons concerned with the Peace Corps in my remarks. Mr. Shriver said of Phillip and Nancy Ann that both were "outstanding volunteers performing valuable service to mankind. They could have devoted their lives to no more valuable effort. I extend my deepest sympathy to the parents and friends of these fine young people."

The superintendent of schools for Agusan Province said that these two were "outstanding Americans who were doing highly competent work, they will be missed greatly."

Ameito Mutuc, Philippine Ambassador to the United States, said:

Nancy Ann Boyd and Phillip Maggard exemplified a new and dedicated breed of young Americans who are giving of their best to extend the variety and strength of

the free way of life to the far corners of the earth. They consecrated their lives to the pursuit of peace and thus contributed to the important work of imparting peace and fostering good will and the democratic way of life which is the mission of the Peace Corps.

SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, over the past few years there have been many carefully researched articles in the American press dealing with the increasing manifestations of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union, and with the evidence that the Soviet officials are themselves deliberately fanning the flames.

Last June 28, I wrote to the Department of State in connection with this situation and I urged that some dramatic action be taken to make manifest our official displeasure over the persecution of religious minorities in the Soviet Union.

In a lengthy reply on July 11, 1962, Assistant Secretary of State Frederick G. Dutton wrote, among other things, that it is "not possible to determine whether Soviet Jews are deliberately being singled out as Jews for a disproportionate amount of condemnation and victimization."

I must confess that I found it difficult to understand Mr. Dutton's uncertainty because it seemed to me at the time that there was overwhelming evidence that the Soviet Jews were, in fact, the victims of special persecution. In this connection, I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate an article which appeared in the London Observer for Sunday, January 13. This article, written by the Soviet expert, Edward Crankshaw, clearly points the finger at Prime Minister Khrushchev, himself, as the chief condoner, if not the chief instigator, of the persecution of the Soviet Jews.

Mr. President, in 1954, during the 83d Congress, I was a member of the Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression and Forced Incorporation of the Baltic States into the U.S.S.R. At that time, on September 22 and 23, 1954, we conducted hearings on the treatment of Jews by the Soviets. A report was published as a result of those hearings. I believe that the conclusions reached in the committee's study are worthy of reiteration, for the past 9 years have produced no evidence to indicate a contrary determination. The report stated:

Indeed, the conclusion to which one is driven by the great mass of evidence presented to this committee is that the official and deliberate policy of communism was aimed directly at forced assimilation of the Jews as the preferred technique for exterminating the Jews as a people.

The end result sought by the Communists stands revealed by the evidence, therefore, as being no different from the end result sought by the Nazis.

As the Observer article indicates, this continuing Soviet racism reveals not only to the world but also to the Soviet people that Communist deeds do not match Communist words.

This is a lesson that will stand us in good stead in all of our dealings with the Communists.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article from the London Sunday Observer be inserted into the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MR. K. IS WORRIED OVER JEWS

(By Edward Crankshaw)

The position of Jewry in the Soviet Union continues to worry Mr. Khrushchev—and the Jews.

According to a reliable report from Moscow, the much-publicized meeting on December 17 of writers, artists, and musicians with the highest Government leaders, including Mr. Khrushchev himself, was largely taken up with a bitter argument on and around anti-Semitism.

None of this was published in official versions of the speeches at that meeting because the Soviet Government has been advised by certain satellite leaders that the latest drive against Soviet Jewry—the arrest of rabbis and Jewish leaders on currency charges, the steady closing of synagogues—has been creating a poor impression in the outside world.

Mr. Khrushchev himself was uneasily half-defensive, half-aggressive. There was no more anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union, he said, because "the nationalities question has been solved." There was only "individual anti-Semitism."

Nevertheless, it was better for Jews not to hold top positions in the Government because this only provoked popular resentment. He had already said all this to the leaders of Poland and Hungary in 1956, and in his view the revolt in those countries were largely due to the fact that there had been too many Jews in top Government posts.

CONSTERNATION

The occasion for these remarks seems to have been the attack by Mr. Ilychev on the composer, Shostakovich, for using Yevtushenko's poem about the Nazi massacre of the Kiev Jews at Babi Yar as the text for his new symphony. The remarks produced so much consternation that afterward Mr. Khrushchev was moved to go up to Ilya Ehrenburg, who had also been violently attacked by another speaker, and assure him that his words were not directed at him personally. "You must understand that as a professional politician I have to take things as I find them and warn against dangers."

These words do not ring quite true in view of the sustained attack, increasing all through 1962, on Jewish culture and Jewish religious observances. At least 10 important centers of Jewish population have had their synagogues closed down in recent months, making a total of at least 60 since 1959.

Over 60 percent of the published total of all those persons shot for "speculation" and similar activities have been Jews; and in some of the trials synagogues were described as the meeting place for "crooks and speculators."

PILLORIED BY PRESS

One of the most important closures was the Lvov synagogue on November 5 last year. Lvov, capital of the Western Ukraine, has been traditionally a great Jewish center, and even now there remain between 30,000 and 40,000 Jews. These now have no place of worship.

Their synagogue was closed after a series of articles in Lvov Pravda, the local party journal, had stigmatized it as a black-market center, and named various offenders; these were then tried and given heavy prison sentences.

Lvov Pravda subsequently published "demands" by Jewish workers that the synagogue should be closed, and it was.

Other synagogues closed last year were those at Sverdlovsk, with 40,000 Jews; Zhito-

mir, with 30,000; Kazan, with 25,000; Grozny, with 12,000; and many more.

In many places Jews meeting for prayer in private houses have been dispersed by the police and pilloried in the press.

For the first time in Soviet history, 1962 saw the banning of the manufacture of mazot, or unleavened bread, and the prohibition of parcels containing mazot from abroad.

The only Jewish religious seminary in the whole of Russia was immunized by the simple process of denying residential permits to 9 of its 15 students. "Individual anti-Semitism" seems to be running pretty high.

SUZANNE LABIN: JOAN OF ARC OF FREEDOM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, a number of my colleagues have shared the pleasure with me of meeting with Madam Suzanne Labin, the remarkable Frenchwoman who has done so much in recent years to help focus the attention of the free world on the harsh realities of the cold war.

The late Forrest Davis, one of our distinguished American correspondents, described Madam Labin as "the most luminous and eloquent voice of the West against the terrible menace it faces." I, myself, have likened her to Joan of Arc, not only because she is a Frenchwoman and petite, but because of her dedication and her ability to inspire others and because the situation the free world faces in a sense resembles the crisis confronting the French nation when the Maid of Orleans called it to arms.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the Record at this point an article entitled "Suzanne Labin: Joan of Arc of Freedom," by Eugene Lyons, who is nationally known to all of us as a senior editor of Reader's Digest and as an authority on communism.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the American Legion magazine, December 1962]

SUZANNE LABIN: JOAN OF ARC OF FREEDOM (By Eugene Lyons)

Incensed by an anti-Communist book that was making a sensation in France, the Moscow paper Soviet Russia struck out at its author. "Is Suzanne Labin," it asked with heavyhanded irony, "an old maid wearing glasses, sour on the whole world, or a young girl who couldn't pass her school exams?"

Whether posed in ignorance or in malice, the question could hardly have been more grotesquely mistaken, and the Paris publishers exploited Moscow's blunder. In issuing a new edition of the book, "Liberté aux Libérticides" (Freedom for the Murderers of Freedom), they inserted a leaflet to set the comrades straight.

"Since the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R. is inquiring about the author," it said, "we are pleased to comply." A picture of Suzanne Labin attested that she was strikingly good looking; a succinct biography attested that she was a seasoned scholar, held a string of academic degrees, and was happily married. This was in 1957. Since then, we may be sure, Soviet intelligence has caught up with the lady. The Communist press denounces her as the very embodiment of anti-Communist fury, but it no longer raises doubts about her looks or education.

In the intervening years, Suzanne Labin has emerged as the most dynamic, ubiquitous and effective opponent of communism in the free world. She is today as well known and as highly esteemed among dedicated anti-Communists in Asia, Latin America, and the United States, as she is in her native France and Europe. The shelf full of her books, pamphlets, and articles adds up to a hardheaded course on the theory and practice of political warfare. She accepts repeated threats of death that reach her by mail and by phone, as accolades from the enemy. The same applies to an attempt to kidnap her in New Delhi, when she escaped from a car that was taking her to the Soviet Embassy.

Senator THOMAS J. DODD has called Suzanne the Joan of Arc of freedom against communism, and he is not the only one. Because she is a Frenchwoman, petite, and a magnificent crusader, it was inevitable that she should be compared to the Maid of Orleans. The late Forrest Davis wrote, in addition, that she is the most luminous and eloquent voice of the West against the terrible menace it faces. Edmond Michelet, a former Minister of Justice, spoke of her as our magnificent, unique Suzanne Labin.

Certainly, political dynamite has rarely come in a smaller or more attractive package. A natural blonde with flashing eyes and a radiant smile, she ekes out 5 feet of height on high heels. In addressing large audiences around the world, she often has to stand on a box to get her head above the lectern. Somehow, the contrast between her feminine charm and her robust logic adds dimensions to the total impression. Whether in French, English, or Spanish, her eloquence is seasoned with Gallic wit.

Both her zeal and her energy seem inexhaustible. Consider her visit to the United States this summer:

She had traveled halfway around the globe, from her home in Paris to Seoul, Korea, to take part in an Extraordinary Congress of the Asian People's Anti-Communist League. The delegates and observers from some 30 countries regarded this tiny Westerner—the chief European correspondent of the league's official organ—as one of their very own. The principal achievement of the Congress was the adoption of Suzanne Labin's plan to create a permanent freedom center in Seoul—an Asian equivalent of the Freedom Academy project now bottled up in congressional committees in Washington.

The freedom center, which has the official support of the Korean and South Vietnam Governments, will "initiate and develop an integrated, operational science to educate and train anti-Communist leaders and cadres superior to Communist cold war professionals, and to develop a specific program designed to unmask and frustrate the false propaganda of the Communists and to propagate the gospels of freedom." The wording clearly bears the imprint of Mme. Labin's mind and style.

With this accomplished, she felt that there was work to do in America in connection with the mounting Red threats in southeast Asia. Therefore, instead of returning home directly, she went on to the United States. Her itinerary here included Los Angeles, San Francisco, Kansas City, St. Louis, Chicago, New York, Philadelphia, and Washington. Into about 5 weeks, she managed to pack 26 lectures (all but a few gratis), a dozen press conferences, 18 radio and television appearances, and uncounted consultations with individual anti-Communists and political leaders.

She wound up the tour by addressing 2 luncheons in Washington—I tendered by Senator DODD and attended by 25 Senators, the other by Congressman WALTER H. JUDT, attended by 37 Representatives. Reluctantly, she declined other American invitations because she had to rush to Paris to supervise the filming of her documentary—"In

Berlin, Freedom Is at Stake"—in time for the anniversary of the Berlin wall, and to prepare for a scheduled lecture tour in South America soon thereafter.

In New York, where we shared the platform at an anti-Communist seminar at the Commodore Hotel, Suzanne Labin explained the main purpose of her American trip to me. She was thoroughly alarmed by the intensive propaganda underway in the free world, and especially in the United States, against the government of Ngo Dinh Diem in South Vietnam.

"I wanted to warn anti-Communists in your country," she explained, "and as much of the public as I could reach, that the anti-Diem campaign is Communist inspired. It aims to discourage and if possible put an end to American support of the Saigon government in its life-and-death struggle against the Red guerrilla offensive."

This, indeed, was the message running through all her private and public talks while she was in our country. She recalled how similar propaganda against Chiang Kai-shek, in which the Mao Tse-tung forces were pictured as just agrarian reformers, helped bring about the fall of China. Always, she emphasized, when the Communists concentrate on conquering some country, the incumbent anti-Communist regime becomes the target of systematic attack in the free world. Now, she said, it was President Diem's turn.

In South Vietnam, the United States had decided to back the Saigon government against the Communist invasion. "This was too much for the numerous species of auxiliaries and dupes of the Kremlin," she wrote in the Washington World. "A case of true resistance to communism cannot be tolerated. Therefore, an immense campaign was launched through the powerful press of capitulation to decay and kill our ally of Saigon." Point by point, she then refuted the lies and half-truths about the Diem regime being spread by the Red propaganda apparatus—in print, on the air, through knowing allies and eager dupes.

In the last few years, Mme. Labin has made several extensive trips through South Vietnam, questioning its people, addressing meetings in towns and villages, checking anti-Diem allegations on the spot. Though the Government has its faults—to expect Western-style democracy in southeast Asia would be naive, she says—it has improved the lot of the people and was making exciting progress in agrarian reform until Communist terror slowed up the process.

The guerrilla offensive is not a popular revolt, as a portion of the Western press would have us believe, but "a prefabricated affair, telegraphed from headquarters in Communist Hanoi and Peking. We should never forget," Suzanne Labin told American audiences, "that more than a million persons have fled from North to South Vietnam. There would have been millions more had the borders not been closed in brutal violation of the Geneva agreement dividing Vietnam. You must see to it that the blunders the great democracies made in China, then in French Indochina, are not repeated in South Vietnam."

I had met Suzanne Labin briefly when she was in the United States in 1959. But I was able to observe her in full action for the first time in December 1960. It was a phenomenon not easily forgotten—a demonstration of what one dedicated and tireless woman, without money, without official support, despite the apathy of the press, could accomplish.

The occasion was the 3-day International Conference on Political Warfare, in Paris: the first global gathering of "activists" in the struggle against communism, above national and party line, ever staged. It was Suzanne Labin who had conceived and planned the enterprise; she who, almost

singlehandedly and against heartbreaking odds, had mobilized the convocation.

Some 400 delegates showed up—trade union leaders, parliamentarians, writers, exile leaders from Communist-captive countries, and others—mostly as individuals, some as spokesmen for organizations. About three-quarters were French, of course, but the rest came from 15 other countries and included 10 Asians, 6 Africans, and a small American contingent. The whole spectrum of anti-Communist thinking and feeling, from right to left, was represented, in a search for common ground against the common enemy.

Like others before her, Suzanne Labin had learned the hard way that the rich seem indifferent to their own peril. Her efforts to raise money for the conference had netted only \$2,400. Undismayed, she had proceeded with the project on that shoestring. She obtained a meeting hall, rent free, and managed to borrow tape recorders and crude simultaneous translation equipment. The delegates paid their own fares and expenses; in fact, on one occasion when the shoestring gave out, they raised the needed francs by passing the hat at the conference.

The first session, held in the NATO auditorium, was opened with an address by Paul-Henri Spaak, then Secretary General of NATO. Those who attended the sessions that followed, held in a cramped and shabby Paris hall, heard speeches by dozens of the world's most stalwart and knowledgeable anti-Communists. Among these were French leaders like Maurice Schumann; the Vice President of West Germany's Bundestag, Richard Jaeger; the Spanish philosopher, Salvador de Madariaga; a top official from South Vietnam; and Senators DODD and KENNETH KEATING.

Most of the participants were unknown to each other, but all of them knew the gallant little Frenchwoman. She was the dominant figure throughout, the heart and soul of the gathering and, in terms of ideas, its brain as well. Her several appearances on the speaker's rostrum were inspirational and deadly serious, but always spiced with humor. In a keynote address she raised three slogans: (1) "Freemen of all nations, unite"; (2) "What is the use of filling our arms with weapons, if we let the enemy disarm our brains"; and (3) "Communism must kill freedom abroad, otherwise freedom will kill communism at home." These set the tone for much that followed.

Selections from the 3 days of oratory and argument appeared in book form a few months later, in French, under the title "Life or Death of the Free World." That, too, was made possible only by Mme. Labin's exertions in editing the vast materials and raising the modest financing for publication. The Italian delegates had been so impressed that they took the initiative in staging a second such world conference, in Rome, a year later. Again it brought together some 400 men and women from all over the world, and again Suzanne Labin played a major role. If her efforts to that end bear fruit, the most important of this series of worldwide consultations will be held in the United States.

What she envisages, ultimately, is a permanent worldwide organization not unlike the Asian People's Anti-Communist League in its own area. Slowly, painfully, that sort of global counterforce to communism may be taking shape. The fact that thus far it has received not the slightest encouragement or aid from the great democratic governments gives point to something I heard her say at the Hotel Commodore seminar:

"The most important thing to stop the spread of communism is not help for underdeveloped countries in the East but help for underdeveloped minds in the West."

Suzanne Andrée Devoyon was born in a slum district of Paris, one of four children

in a desperately poor family. Both parents were factory workers, but the father ceased to contribute early and the whole burden fell on the mother. Though she labored literally day and night, they often knew the bitter taste of hunger.

She was a blond doll, this Suzanne—only 2 feet high at the age of 6—but remarkably pretty and bright. Mother Devoyon was determined that her daughter get an education. Luckily, the girl easily won scholarships, though they came to little enough, and in due time she entered the Sorbonne.

She had been brought up in the revolutionary traditions of the French working class. Devoyon forebears took part in the Paris Commune of 1871, and her mother was active in the semianarchist French Union movement at the turn of the century. At an age when other girls were stuffing on romantic novels, Suzanne was chewing on Marx and Engels.

It was then the popular front period. On the campus, politics all but drowned out learning. Suzanne Devoyon threw herself into the student fight against pro-Fascist groups. From the first, however, she was repelled by the unfair and immoral tactics of the campus Communists and refused to join their organizations. In time, she found herself fighting both extremes.

One evening, Suzanne was cornered in a dark Sorbonne corridor by an excited "fascist" brigade bent on beating up its opponents. In the nick of time an "anti-fascist" squadron came to her rescue. The young man who headed the rescue party claimed the spoils of victory—he steered the tiny blonde to a cafe on Boulevard Saint-Michel and never let her go again. Edouard Labin was his name—tall, fair-haired and handsome, the son of a relatively well-to-do intellectual family, he was completing his studies in physics.

Edouard, at the time they met, had been a young Communist and had resigned in disgust. Their common dislike of the booming ideology helped the courtship, which led within a few months to a student marriage. They compared and solemnly discussed their political views down the line, and ended by renouncing Marxism. They joined a moderate non-Marxist faction of the Socialist Party (roughly equivalent to liberalism in Anglo-Saxon countries), to which they still adhere.

The young husband took his degree in science and went on to a successful career in electronics; in recent years he has specialized in automation. Suzanne, by the time she obtained her master's degree in chemistry and physiology at Sorbonne, decided that her real interests were in the social sciences. With Edouard's consent, she enrolled in the famous Ecole des Hautes Etudes Sociales et Internationales.

One of the professors, the famous historian Charles Seignobos, proposed that for her master's thesis she undertake a study in depth of living standards in leading countries, among these the Soviet Union. This, she has said, proved to be a turning point in her political and scholarly career. She had rejected communism for moral reasons, but went along with the widespread belief that the Soviet system, for all its faults, was bringing benefits to the Russian workers. Now, delving into the facts, she was soon disillusioned on this score.

After graduating with honors, she continued research on Soviet Russia. Her first two articles based on this work were promptly accepted and published by leading Paris magazines and led to a request for a book by a top publisher. Her course was set—she would be a political writer, with a searching, uninhibited book on Russia as the immediate goal.

But the war intervened. Edouard went into the army. Suzanne fled to Vichy as the Germans advanced. There her husband, having been demobilized, joined her before

long. Together they worked in a resistance group which attained fame under the name "Reseau du Musée de l'Homme"—their underground services are mentioned in the two books about this period by André Weill Curjel. Edouard's skills in the electronics field were especially useful in procuring and setting up secret radio transmitters.

Because of treason within the group, however, the Labins soon had to flee for their lives. Pierre Laval himself signed the order for their interception and arrest. But they succeeded, after a series of close escapes, in reaching Spain and from there went on to Argentina. In all these flights, the Labins sacrificed their wardrobes and other belongings in order to rescue two trunkloads of Suzanne's research materials and manuscripts—the makings of her planned book.

They joined the Buenos Aires section of General de Gaulle's movement. Edouard established an electronics laboratory, one of the first in South America, and later also taught physics at the University of Buenos Aires. Suzanne wrote articles on literature and philosophy for *La Nación* and other leading Latin American publications, and worked on her book. It was completed about the time the war ended—a profound, carefully documented, brutally realistic assessment of communism in practice.

The publishing house that had asked for the book was gone with the winds of war. Suzanne Labin sent the bulky manuscript to one prominent publisher after another, only to get it back. Nearly 30 publishers in France, England and the United States turned it down on the ground that her portrayal of Stalin and his system was too extreme, too emotional, in short "too anti-Soviet." She was discovering how deeply the illusions about communism had taken root in the West during the war years.

Meanwhile, the Labins had returned to Paris. There, in 1948, the book finally was published, under the title "Stalin the Terrible: A Panorama of Soviet Russia." In quick succession, translations appeared in Spanish, English, Italian, Portuguese, and Chinese; the London edition carried an enthusiastic preface by Arthur Koestler.

The book was widely hailed as a definitive work of scholarship and acute insight and, as was to be expected, drew fierce attacks from pro-Soviet quarters. In a foreword to the volume, the author defended the moral passion she had brought to the writing. In dealing with the monstrous truths about communism, she argued, she was under no moral obligation to conceal her sense of horror. "I claim," she wrote, "that I have studied communism with total objectivity and that this very objectivity leads me to a total condemnation. I am objective but not neutral."

The evolution of this woman's thought and attitudes thereafter, seems to me fascinating. Space limitations, however, allow only a summary statement. Suffice that her study of communism turned her to search for antidotes to its poisons, and gradually the scholar evolved into an anti-Communist activist, the analyst into a fervid crusader.

Her articles and lectures increasingly explored the nature of freedom, as well as its weaknesses, failures, and inhibitions in meeting the totalitarian challenge. She developed these ideas in a book first published in Paris in 1954 and 2 years later, under the title "The Secret of Democracy," in New York. Then, in 1957, came her book, "Freedom for the Murderers of Freedom." The question it raised was whether democracy is really compelled, by its principles, to commit suicide by guaranteeing freedom to those plotting to obliterate freedom. The answer was an incisive "No."

Madam Labin cut through the haze of sophisms and semantics to prove that democracies have not only the moral duty but

the juridical right to suppress Communist and other totalitarian organizations. The conclusion was not new, but coming from a prominent liberal, it attracted immense attention and touched off passionate debate. The book won the French Liberty Award.

Embodied in this work was the author's civic code, a clear formulation in practical, legal terms of society's obligation to outlaw those committed to its enslavement. Since it threatened their most important advantage—their right to organize freely—the Communists were thoroughly alarmed by the civic code. The mouthpiece of their party, *l'Humanité*, attacked in fury and so did the Soviet press.

While she was attending a meeting of the Pen Club in Tokyo, Suzanne Labin received invitations from their governments to visit and lecture in South Vietnam and Taiwan (Formosa). This led to the first of four extensive tours of the Far East in as many years. She met all the anti-Communist leaders and, with a scholar's zeal, learned about the peoples and the problems in the area. By this time she is the Westerner best known and most admired by Asians seriously fighting the Communist plague.

Among the literary products of her deepening concern with Asia is the book which was published in America in 1959 as "The Anthill." It is a closeup and devastating account of life in Red China, based on systematic interviews with dozens of Chinese refugees in Hong Kong and Macao, carefully selected to provide a true cross section of the country's people.

When the Fourth French Republic fell and General de Gaulle came to power, June 1, 1958, a commission was set up to edit a new Constitution. Suzanne Labin saw in this an opportunity to put her civic code into law. She launched a remarkable campaign for that purpose and fought fiercely, often working round the clock, through friends on the commission and through the press. *L'Humanité* thundered against what it called the Mollet-Labin Civic Code and others rallied against "the De Gaulle-Labin constitution." Telephone calls warned Suzanne Labin that she would be assassinated if she didn't desist. She didn't—and the campaign was successful.

Article IV of the new constitution guarantees the free functioning of all political parties—provided the goals and methods are democratic and they are not subservient to a foreign power. This was the substance of the Labin civic code. Unfortunately, De Gaulle, for reasons of his own, has as yet failed to apply this provision, but the continued existence of the French Communist Party is today clearly in violation of the constitution.

In her writings and speeches all over the world, during the last 5 or 6 years, Suzanne Labin's emphasis has been increasingly on the urgent need to engage in political-psychological warfare. While concentrating on military defenses, she points out, the free nations remain in effect unilaterally disarmed in the decisive nonmilitary areas. Endlessly she warns that our world is doomed to defeat by default, unless it finally develops political strategy and tactics on a scale for victory in the cold war.

This was the crucial warning she was eager to project in London in June 1959 when leading people from 15 member nations met to mark the 10th anniversary of NATO. The conference was opened with great pomp by Queen Elizabeth. As a member of the French delegation, Mme. Labin had herself designated to report on Soviet propaganda, though the subject was not on the original agenda.

She had come prepared for the assignment and worked feverishly on the completion of an ambitious, documented, and closely reasoned paper: "The Techniques of Soviet Propaganda." It not only disclosed the

startling dimensions and vast diversity of the Red political offensive, but sketched a free world counteroffensive. Appeasement-minded elements which dominated the proceedings, having gotten wind of the nature of her contribution, tried by pressure and intrigue to silence her.

But she succeeded in reading her report into the record and it was generally acknowledged as the high point of the London meeting. More than that: with the help of an influential American participant, Gen. David Sarnoff, she proposed and forced the adoption of a resolution asking NATO to create special machinery for dealing with propaganda, subversion and other nonmilitary types of Communist aggression.

The resolution languishes in NATO files, ignored. But the effect of the Labin paper on world opinion has been considerable. Issued in pamphlet form by the U.S. Senate Committee on Internal Security, it has sold over 150,000 copies. This makes it, by a wide margin, the committee's alltime bestseller. Tens of thousands more copies were distributed by the "Committee of One Million," the American group opposing recognition of Red China. In expanded form, Mme. Labin also published it as a book, titled "Il Est Moins Cinq."

Her activities have been so multifarious that they cannot be recounted here in full. Let me just cite one episode typical of her dynamic response to events:

When the Hungarian people suddenly rose in revolt, she wrote at once a vibrant and now famous appeal for support of the Freedom Fighters. In days and sleepless nights on the telephone, she and her husband obtained hundreds of prominent signatures for the appeal. The literary paper *Figaro* was moved to provide her with secretaries and telephones, others volunteered help, and soon the list of signers grew to 3,500, among them virtually all the outstanding writers, artists and opinion leaders of France.

Whatever the challenge—Hungary, Cuba, Katanga, Red China, Vietnam—this diminutive blond has been in the forefront of enterprises to stem the tide of communism. Edouard Labin has worked with her, always in the background; though his income is moderate, he has footed the bills for most of her activities and travels.

In America, too, Suzanne Labin has become a familiar name to militant anti-Communists. During her first visit here, in 1959, she was asked for her impressions of the American people. Her answer: "They are what everybody abroad believes they are not: a highly cultivated people; and they are not what everybody abroad believes they are: an anti-Communist Nation." In her most recent visit she gladly revised the last part of that aphorism. The American people, she felt, were finally coming awake to the crowding menace of communism. If the awareness can be turned into world leadership on policy, she believes, communism can still be defeated.

What is needed, as Suzanne Labin sees it, is "a sacred union of all free men against communism," whatever their differences on other issues. The political struggle against the Moscow-Peking axis and its worldwide apparatus of conflict must be given unquestioned priority. "Let us hear among us," she pleads, "the old cry of the besieged: Unite or perish."

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on Friday, March 1, 1963, the archdiocesan newspaper, the *Catholic Review*, printed a pastoral letter by His Excellency Lawrence J. Shehan, archbishop of Baltimore, on the question of racial discrimination.

This was a notable letter in that it eloquently presented the civil rights issue in its true moral and religious context.

Archbishop Shehan, who was formerly the bishop of the diocese of Bridgeport, Conn., outlined the concrete steps taken by the archdiocese of Baltimore to eliminate all vestiges of racial discrimination in the schools, hospitals and other facilities under its jurisdiction. But he pointed out that while agencies of the Government and of the church have accomplished a great deal in the field of civil rights, and should accomplish more, essentially, this is a problem for everyone; a problem that can be solved only by the application of justice and charity.

I believe that this statement by Archbishop Shehan should be widely read and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ARCHBISHOP SHEHAN ON RACIAL JUSTICE

Dearly beloved in Christ, in the month of November 1958, the bishops of this country at their annual meeting issued a statement entitled "Discrimination and the Christian Conscience." After noting the rather remarkable progress made by our Negro fellow citizens, particularly during and after the Second World War, toward such goals as political equality, fair educational and economic opportunities, good housing without exploitation, and a full chance for social advancement, the bishops went on to say that in more recent years "the issues have become confused, and the march toward justice and equality has been slowed, if not halted, in some areas. The transcendent moral issues have become obscured and possibly forgotten."

"The heart of the race question," they declared, "is moral and religious. It concerns the rights of man and our attitude toward our fellow man. If our attitude is governed by the great Christian law of love of neighbor and respect for his rights, then we can work out harmoniously the techniques for making legal, educational, economic, and social adjustments. But if our hearts are poisoned by hatred, or even by indifference toward the welfare and rights of our fellow man, then our Nation faces a grave internal crisis."

Among the signers of that document was my beloved predecessor, Archbishop Keough, who was then serving as chairman of the administrative board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference. That the statement served as an expression of his personal conviction on the subject of racial discrimination, no one who knew him could doubt. Coming from a part of the country where such discrimination had never been a major issue, he at first found it difficult to realize the urgency of the problem here, in a State which lies midway between North and South, whose northern boundary has long symbolized the social barrier between two so diverse sections of this country. His gentle and charitable mind found it particularly hard to believe that some of his people would not be convinced and guided by the statement of principle issued by the bishops of this country as their official teaching on the subject of race relations.

Moreover, the illness which weighed so heavily upon the archbishop during the latter years of his tenure prevented him from coming to closer grips with the baffling racial problem and from issuing public directives on this subject to his priests and people.

Events, however, which have occurred during the past 18 months have brought to me the conviction that I ought at this time to speak out in reverence for his memory and in fulfillment of my own duty of conscience.

A pastoral letter on this subject, moreover, seems particularly appropriate in this year when we are observing the centenary of the Proclamation of Emancipation issued by President Lincoln on January 1, 1863. With that document, this country formally undertook to correct and undo the moral and social evil of slavery which had afflicted it from the beginning. The breaking of the shackles of bondage, however, was only the beginning of the process to which this country stood committed. The document by which our forefathers declared their political independence clearly stated the principle by which they justified their rebellion and guided their action in forming a new government: that all men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The struggle to give adequate expression to this principle has been long and arduous. There has been, however, real progress during the past century and—as noted by the American bishops—particularly during the last generation. Yet it is no exaggeration to say that in hardly any State of the Union has complete social, political, economic, and educational equality been established. In some States, the barest beginnings have only recently been made, under intense Federal pressure. Here in our own State, recent experience has shown that much—very much—remains to be done; that grave wrongs still need to be righted.

Nothing should be more evident to the fairminded citizen than the fact that the equality proclaimed by our Declaration of Independence, and the freedom described by it as "unalienable" requires, as a very minimum of justice, the right to equal accommodations, both on public property and within those enterprises licensed and protected by the State for the service of the general public. Yet our proposed State law of equal accommodations has thus far been emasculated by our State legislators. In our own See city, although there is a glaring public evidence of the failure to recognize the right of equal accommodation as properly belonging to the Negro, we are—for the present at least—without such an ordinance.

In this, the oldest and most venerable See in the United States, it should be particularly disconcerting to all of us to know that the recently invalidated equal accommodations ordinance failed to receive the support of some Catholic legislators who represent districts heavily Catholic in population. Does this mean that many of our own people have failed to recognize the serious duty of justice which flows from the basic equality of men of all races and all social conditions?

Such a failure is all the more regrettable since our Christian faith imposes upon us all a special duty of both justice and charity toward all men, no matter what may be their racial and social origin. By the very terms of Christian teaching, we believe that all men are God's special creatures, made to His image and likeness. We believe that the Son of God, Jesus Christ, the God-man, came into the world to save all men; that on the Cross of Calvary He shed His Blood to redeem all of us from our iniquity—all, without any exception. In our eyes as Christians, then, there is a fundamental bond that links us all together in the sight of God and in the order established by Him. We have an essential duty in justice to recognize and to respect equally the rights of all men.

As Catholics, we have an even higher and more sacred duty to all those who are "of

the household of the faith." In his Epistle to the Galatians (3: 28), St. Paul tells us: "You are all children of God through faith in Christ Jesus. For all you, who have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek; there is neither slave nor freedman"—and today St. Paul would certainly have added: There is neither black nor white; neither brown nor yellow—"for you are all one in Christ. Therefore, you are no longer strangers and foreigners, but you are citizens with the saints and members of God's household. You are built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets with Christ Jesus as the chief cornerstone. In Him, the whole structure is closely fitted together and grows into a temple holy unto God; in Him, too, you are being built together into a dwelling place for God in the Spirit" (Ephesians 2: 19-22).

Nay more, according to the testimony of the same Apostle, by faith and by baptism we have been incorporated into the mystical body of Christ. For although Christ has given us different functions within His church, He has done this "for the building up of the Body of Christ," which is His church, of which Christ Himself is the Head; "for from Him the whole body derives its increase to the building up of itself in love" (Ephesians 4: 12).

Within this household of the faith, this temple holy to the Lord, this dwelling place of God in the Spirit, this mystical body of Christ, there can be no room for racial discrimination and the bitterness and rancor that inevitably grow out of it. In this year, when the minds and hearts of men are turning longingly and hopefully toward the goal of Christian unity, it is particularly important that justice and charity, without any discrimination or prejudice or antipathy, should shine brightly within the church of Christ. There is, we know—and there can be—only one center of Christian unity: Christ and His mystical body. But how can that body be recognized for what it is unless there is within it unity without division or dissension, and unless within and between its members there shine the justice and charity of Christ?

Within the time and space available to me in this letter, it is impossible to set forth in detail the extent and the nobility of the duty of justice and charity incumbent upon us as members of Christ's mystical body. Under the circumstances of today, however, it may be useful if I attempt to state briefly the minimum that is required of us as members of Christ's church in this archdiocese.

There is, I hope, no need to say that in our churches and in our parochial life generally there must be not only no racial segregation, but also no distinction of rank or place or treatment based upon racial difference: " * * * because we are members one of another. * * * Do not grieve the Holy Spirit of God in whom you were sealed for the day of redemption" (Ephesians 4: 25, 30). "For now the justice of God has been made manifest * * * through faith in Jesus Christ upon all who believe. For there is no distinction: as all have sinned and need the glory of God" (Romans 3: 21-23).

In our schools, both elementary, and secondary, the same general policy holds. As Catholic schools, they are meant primarily, although not exclusively, for Catholic students—for all Catholic students insofar as facilities can be made available—without racial or any other discrimination. This means that in the registration of students a common policy, approved by our Catholic School Board, must be followed in the case of all Catholic children living within the boundaries of every parish fortunate enough to have its own school. The same policy must govern all transfers from one school to another. Within the school, identical acad-

emic standards must apply to all students, and all must be treated with equal justice and charity.

In our diocesan organizations and institutions of charity, a sincere effort has been made over a period of years to eliminate discrimination and to effect true integration. Longstanding social and cultural patterns have at times made this process difficult. With the opening of the new St. Vincent's Home, we believe that the last traces of discrimination in this field will have disappeared.

It is some months now since all our Catholic hospitals gave formal approval and acceptance to the policies of nondiscrimination I specifically proposed. This means that they have agreed to admit and treat applicants for medical and surgical service without distinction in their outpatient departments; to follow the same procedure in admitting patients into the hospital, and in assigning beds to them; that there shall be no discrimination practiced in handling applications for membership on medical, surgical, and nursing staffs; that advancement within each staff will be governed only by ability, training, experience, and character; that a policy of integration and nondiscrimination is to be effective for all employees of the hospital.

In older and outmoded hospital plants, it has sometimes been difficult to eliminate some customs based on age-old prejudices and social patterns, but now that the last of our hospitals, is acquiring a modern building, we are confident that the final traces of segregation and discrimination will disappear.

Some of these policies have been in effect in each of these fields for a long time. We do not claim that any of them go beyond mere justice. I have spelled them out in some detail because of questions which have been raised from time to time.

The duty of justice and charity applies not only to our churches, our schools, our charitable organizations and institutions, and our hospitals, but also to all of us as individuals. It must guide us in our personal relationships—within our block, our neighborhood, our community; in our social and fraternal organizations; in the business we may conduct; in the labor unions to which we may belong; at work and at play; in all the circumstances of everyday life.

Particularly lamentable is the unreasonable and automatic panic, too often fanned by unscrupulous and disreputable real estate brokers and speculators, which accompanies the arrival of a Negro family in an area previously occupied by white families only. The flight that occurs not only unfairly prejudices the new neighbors, but it also works an economic hardship on departing property owners, destroys the community, undermines church life, and hits hard at substantial investments made in schools, rectories, convents, and recreational facilities, as well as in the actual places of worship.

Nor can we afford to overlook the crippling effect that division and dissension within our community have on our efforts to meet what is perhaps the most alarming problem of this and every other large city of the country—crime. This is not the place to go into the sources or causes of crime within our midst. Suffice it to say that no part or group of our people has a monopoly on those sources or causes. What should concern us is that the problem is so great as to call for the best minds and the combined, intense, and persistent efforts of the ablest leaders of all elements within the community. In saying this, we reflect in no way on the police force of either city or State. On the contrary, we have complete confidence in the integrity and ability of both the heads and the ranks of our police departments. But this prob-

lem is one that requires the continuing scrutiny and efforts of the community as a whole. It will not be met adequately if there is dissension, division, suspicion between the two chief racial groups of our citizens.

Even to enumerate our present duties and policies brings vividly to our minds our past defects. Those defects we frankly admit. With humility and regret, we Catholics must acknowledge that we have been all too slow in the correction of our shortcomings, although in the light of the experience of many of our forefathers, we should have been particularly sensitive to the unjust inequalities suffered by other groups. For this reason, we have a special obligation to place ourselves in the forefront of movements to remove the injustices and discriminations which still remain.

We are all aware of the present grave social problems which have had their origin in racial prejudices and tensions, and which are fed by longstanding racial antipathies. These problems cannot be suddenly solved or wiped out by wishful thinking or good intentions. They are community problems. They, therefore, cannot be successfully met by any one part of the community nor any one group, however, highminded and earnest. They call for the combined thought and planning and cooperation of all of us. They require patience and understanding and good will, and persistent effort on the part of everyone. They call for a sense of justice, above all, in that part of the community in which the evil had its origin, and a spirit of charity on both sides.

In their 1958 statement, the bishops of this country, while calling for concrete plans for the elimination of discrimination and the establishment of equal justice and opportunities, urged that such plans be based upon prudence—the virtue which inclines us to view problems in their proper perspective. The problems we inherit today, they noted, are rooted in decades, even centuries, of custom and cultural patterns. When we are confronted with complex and far-reaching evils, it is not a sign of weakness or timidity to weigh carefully the proposed remedies and reforms. Some changes are more necessary than others. Some may be easy to achieve; others may seem impossible at a given time. It is the mark of wisdom, rather than of weakness, to study problems fully and to form plans carefully. Prudence will indeed guard against the rashness which may endanger solid accomplishment, but prudence must never serve as an excuse for inaction or unnecessary gradualism, or as a reason for not holding a straight, steady course toward our goal of full justice.

In this letter, my dearly beloved people, I have spoken chiefly of our duties of justice, because they are so basic to our relations with our fellow men. During this season of Lent, it is well for us to ponder these duties and to reflect on our conduct to see whether our attitude and our acts measure up to what God requires of us. Lent, furthermore, is a season of repentance when, having seen clearly our shortcomings, we seek to bring about the needed reforms. But Lent is also a season when the church places constantly before us the mystery of our redemption, the mystery of that infinite love of God for us which seeks from us in return not only love for Himself, but also love for our fellow men. In that magnificent passage from the First Epistle to the Corinthians which formed the lesson of last Sunday's mass, St. Paul has shown us what our Christian love for each other must be: "Charity is patient, is kind, does not envy, is not pretentious * * * rejoices with the truth, bears all things, hopes all things, endures all things. * * * If I have not charity, I am nothing. I have become as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal." These words of the Apostle serve as a

commentary to our Lord's saying: "By this shall all men know that you are My disciples, that you have love one for another" (John 13: 35).

In this era of the Second Vatican Council, Pope John has given us an example not only of the charity but also of the wisdom and courage which we here in the Archdiocese of Baltimore need for the solution of the problems of race prejudice and discrimination which we find within our civil community and also within our Catholic community, our own particular "household of the faith."

It has been due to the wisdom of our present Holy Father and his two great predecessors that the council presents to the world a true image of the unity and universality of the church as Christ must have meant it. In the hall of the council, men of all races and nations take their places in perfect equality—in the College of Cardinals in the ranks of archbishops and bishops, and of priest superiors of religious orders. All speak with equal freedom; all vote with equal force. To help us allay some of the prejudices which beset this country, it may be well to recall that some of the most effective voices within the council have been those of African archbishops and bishops who by birth stand much closer to the hills and plains and wilds of Africa than the Negroes in our midst.

The charity of Pope John has not only transfused the council, giving to it its unique pastoral spirit; it has also overcome many of the prejudices and antipathies of countless non-Catholic brethren, giving to them a new vision of the church. It has awakened in all of us new longings and new hopes for Christian unity. Such charity within ourselves could enable us to purge from ourselves whatever racial prejudices and antagonisms we may still retain, and could help us to give to our non-Catholic Negro brethren such a vision of Christ's church as might open for them the door to spiritual truth.

Finally, the courage with which Pope John in the face of so many difficulties and adverse predictions, called into being this council, which may well prove to be one of the great turning points of the church's history, should lead us to face our own problems full of Christian faith and confidence and fortitude. In that ecumenical spirit of Christian renewal which, in the words of Pope John, is meant to restore to the church the simple, pure lines of her pristine beauty, let us—priests and people of this archdiocese—face boldly and confidently the task that is before us, certain that with God's help we shall achieve in the church of this archdiocese a holy unity, free from all stain of prejudice and from every defect of division or discrimination.

Sincerely yours in Christ,
LAWRENCE J. SHEHAN,
Archbishop of Baltimore.

THREATENED NATIONALIZATION OF OIL INDUSTRY IN INDONESIA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, a recent news article in the Wall Street Journal reports that Indonesia has raised the threat of immediate nationalization of the oil industry in this country. The activity on the part of President Sukarno not only in his own domestic affairs but internationally as well should be carefully scrutinized by the administration in order to protect ourselves against another Cuba.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDONESIA WARNS FOREIGN-OWNED OIL FIRMS TO AGREE TO CONCESSIONS OR FACE SEIZURE

JAKARTA.—Indonesia has raised the threat of immediate nationalization in its deadlocked negotiations with the three foreign-owned oil companies over terms of a new concession agreement.

Chaerul Saleh, the island nation's Minister of Mining and Basic Industries, declared the Government doesn't intend to wait any longer to reach an accord. The sides already have spent more than 2 years debating royalties, a long-term plan for eventual Government ownership and, a new issue, restrictions on rupiahs (Indonesian money) earned on domestic sales.

The Government, Mr. Saleh stated, may take "necessary measures in accordance with the situation" unless a settlement is reached soon.

STAKES WOULD BE HIGH

To some officials here, the statement was a thinly veiled warning that Indonesia was considering a quick seizure of the oilfield facilities and refineries of the three foreign concerns: Caltex Pacific, jointly owned by Standard Oil Co. of California and Texaco, Inc.; Standard Vacuum Petroleum, owned by Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) and Socony Mobil Oil Co. and Shell Indonesia, a unit of the Royal Dutch-Shell Group.

"It's a real threat," say one U.S. Embassy official. But he tempers his appraisal. "We can't really believe they really would take such a foolish action. After all, they need the revenue from oil sales and they're very conscious of what happened in Ceylon," he notes. The United States recently cut off all aid to Ceylon when it refused to make payment for nationalized oil properties to their U.S. owners.

The stakes in a conflict would be high. The United States in the fiscal year ending in June is extending about \$71 million in economic assistance to Indonesia. And the three foreign oil companies earn Indonesia \$300 million a year, returning the country about 40 percent of its foreign exchange credits.

At issue in the negotiations are oil concessions on the Indonesian island of Sumatra and in West Borneo originally granted by the Netherlands more than 30 years ago. Indonesia permitted the companies to continue their operations after the southeast Asian nation won its independence in 1949. But President Sukarno's leftward-leaning Government pressed for revisions in the concession terms.

Formal negotiations began early in 1960, but progress has been tediously slow. The Government tried to intensify pressure for an agreement by imposing a series of deadlines, but these with no apparent consequence. The latest deadline expired December 31.

Minister Saleh now, however, has imposed a new deadline—butressed with the threat of immediate nationalization—that could be crucial. He has indicated he will submit new draft contracts within a week. The companies then have 2 weeks to submit their final positions.

Some of the Government's previous demands were met earlier by the oil companies. The concerns separately agreed to give the Government a 60-percent share of their profit, instead of the 50-percent slice extended to the Dutch. In addition, the companies agreed to a long-term timetable for eventually turning over to the Government without compensation all their refineries, production facilities, and domestic marketing operations in Indonesia.

TERMS CALLED IMPOSSIBLE

But then, according to one U.S. oil executive, the Government suddenly submitted new proposals on February 2 that are "negative in attitude and bombastic in language." The terms, says another U.S. official, are "impossible to accept."

The Government's latest proposals insist the foreign companies bring in dollars and other foreign exchange to cover production costs in Indonesia, rather than utilize rupiahs earned from local sales of petroleum products. These rupiahs would be blocked in Indonesian bank accounts, subject to Government approval for repatriation.

The oil companies also are asked to waive any claims for compensation should their oil facilities be seized by the Government "in the interest of national security." The companies argue they have invested close to \$1 billion in their oil properties in the past 20 years.

The foreign-owned concerns, nonetheless, are willing to turn over their facilities to the Government at some future date. By late last year, they say, they had agreed to relinquish their refineries within 20 years and their Indonesian marketing facilities within 5 years.

But even this agreement was rendered obsolete, they insist, by a later Indonesian demand. The Government wants ownership of the refineries within 10 years and of the domestic marketing facilities in 1 to 5 years.

Indonesia already is engaged in the oil business on a limited basis. Three state-owned companies currently produce about 50,000 barrels of crude oil a day. The three private concerns, by contrast, produce more than 400,000 barrels a day. Caltex Pacific's output is about 220,000 barrels. Standard Vacuum produces about 10,000 barrels and Shell Indonesia about 115,000 barrels a day.

AMERICAN AID TO INDONESIA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, in the Sunday issue of the Washington Post, Chalmers Roberts reports on a 10-day visit to Indonesia. This country of a hundred million people has received since 1949 a total of \$665 million worth of American aid. It is also interesting to note that it has received approximately \$665 million in economic aid from Communist bloc countries excluding a massive Soviet military aid. Because of its strategic geographical position in the South Pacific and because of the great interest the Soviet is showing in its present military buildup, it is my belief that all pertinent information on this area should be carefully scrutinized.

I ask unanimous consent that this article by Mr. Roberts be included at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RICH INDONESIA IN DEEP TROUBLE ECONOMICALLY

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

DJAKARTA.—Indonesia is in economic trouble so deep that something probably is going to happen, and happen sooner rather than later.

This reporter has spent 10 days in Indonesia, chiefly in Java, where 65 million of the nation's estimated 100 million people live. Few lands are more lush or richer in natural resources. But Indonesia is more frustrating than most nations when it comes to trying to estimate where it is headed.

In talks with Indonesians, high and low, and with foreign observers of several nationalities, it is evident that economic conditions have greatly deteriorated in the past 6 months. Rice, the basic staple, is in short supply and prices have been rising erratically.

Copra, the coconut product, lies rotting or is burned because of price problems and disorganized transportation. Communists are alleged to be behind the burning of some sugarcane in the fields. People lack sugar and oils, and margarine has about disappeared. Indonesia is the world's No. 1 importer of rice, yet it is the world's fourth largest producer.

AN ELASTIC CURRENCY

The exchange rate of the Indonesian currency, the rupiah, reflects these economic troubles. The "official" rate is 45 to \$1, the figure at which the United States must spend the rupiahs it receives in exchange for the food it sends here under Public Law 480. At the Hotel Indonesia, here in Djakarta, the nation's one first-rate hostelry, there is a 500 to \$1 rate for food but room bills for foreigners must be paid in dollars or other hard currencies. The black market rupiah rate both here and in Singapore, however, has advanced in the past 6 months from 600 to \$1 to about 1,300 to \$1.

The result is too much money in circulation, too few goods for the rank and file to buy, inflated prices of rice in the free market (which is used to supplement the absolutely vital rice allowances supplied to Government and many other employees) and a vast amount of smuggling. It has been learned, for example, that half the Indonesian imports into nearby British Singapore are smuggled there from Sumatra or the islands off its coast.

Indonesia is still 80 percent agricultural and rural, only 20 percent industrialized, and few of the industries employ even 1,000 people. Yet industry as a whole is estimated to be running at only around 20 percent of capacity. This means less goods badly needed at home and less for exports to earn dollars to pay for badly needed imports. Smuggling, too, cuts deeply into foreign exchange earnings.

AID HAS BEEN MASSIVE

American aid to Indonesia since independence in 1949 has totaled around \$665 million, of which about 45 percent has been in farm surplus items. Aid from all free world nations (of which Japanese reparations, credits and grants together slightly top the American total) has amounted to more than \$1.5 billion, compared to an estimated \$665 million in economic aid from the Communist bloc. This excludes the massive Soviet military aid.

The U.S.-built cement plant, Indonesia's biggest, is one of the few places now running at 100 percent capacity, and the United States is building a urea fertilizer plant. Each was financed by an Export-Import Bank loan and each will provide about one-third of the national need for its output. The World Bank won't do business here, so poor is Indonesia's credit rating and so shaky its economic structure.

With such a dismal picture so evident, one would expect an explosion of some sort. But Indonesians seem to have a low boiling point; the farmer somehow manages to eat and the city worker frequently resorts to graft and stealing.

A WEST IRIAN SEQUEL

The optimists here, both Indonesian and foreign, argue that these serious economic conditions are about to be faced. They say that the military rebellion against the government has now been liquidated and the issue of West Irian (West New Guinea) will

be finally solved May 1 when that territory comes under Indonesian rule by way of the United Nations from the Dutch. Hence now is the time to tackle the economic problems.

Indonesian life, of course, is dominated by President Sukarno, as it has been since independence. He recently said that the time had come to concentrate on the economic problem and the cabinet is reported to have formulated "a basic strategic economic principle for surmounting present economic difficulties."

Critics contend that Indonesia's economic problems are self-made, though they concede that recent floods have added to the woe. Last summer's massive buildup (for a country such as this) for the projected attack on West Irian resulted in commandeering much of the transportation equipment, including the shipping, so vital in a nation of some 3,000 islands stretched across an area the width of the continental United States.

Incidentally, senior military officials have told me that some 30,000 men were within 2 or 3 days of D-day when the Dutch-Indonesian agreement was signed.

Now that some shipping, at least, is coming back to its normal commercial uses, there is an obvious need for a reevaluation of the rupiah and a currency stabilization scheme on an international basis. The hopeful think this will happen; the pessimists do not think that Sukarno, whom they rate as an economic illiterate however high they regard his political prowess, will buckle down to the job and enforce the tough decisions, if, indeed, he makes them.

POSSIBLE RED MAJORITY

Such an economic situation, of course, is ready-made for the Communists. The PKI, the Communist Party of Indonesia, and its related labor organization, known as SOBSI, are very powerful. The party now claims 3.5 million members, up from an earlier 2 million claim.

No one knows how strong they really are, but one measure is the fact that a high official remarked to me that if elections were held today, the PKI would win an absolute majority. Some outside observers tend to think he could be right and not merely justifying the lack of elections. At any rate, Indonesia is still under martial law, though it is supposed to be lifted May 1.

Ten political parties are legal, but they operate in something of a vacuum since no election is in sight. Sukarno has talked vaguely of an election in 1963; other officials say perhaps in 1964, but the franker ones concede that date is illusory, too.

As long as Sukarno is alive—he is now 61—he probably will continue to be the boss. Officials here tend to throw up their hands when you ask what will happen if he disappears, but the general view is that the military would take over with a civilian figurehead.

Sukarno has built his guided democracy on what we might call the principle of consensus; that is, of getting all rival forces to agree. Since he can enforce a high degree of cooperation, Sukarno has made the Communists keep within bounds.

Of late, Sukarno has been talking a good deal about something he calls NASAKOM, an alphabet soup word meaning nationalism, religion, and communism. The third element used to be socialism; the change seems to reflect the growing power of the PKI. Sukarno's proclaimed aim is to run Indonesia on this three-legged stool principle.

The Communists' aim is to increase the strength of their leg and in due course to upset the stool in their direction. Currently, they are pressing for posts in Sukarno's inner cabinet, from which so far they have been excluded though they hold posts in the so-called outer cabinet.

The PKI is said to want the Finance and Information ministries, and the reason is obvious enough; to make more economic troubles and to control the already left-tinted public utterances of the Government and the press.

The PKI, incidentally, is officially oriented toward Peking in its ideological dispute with Moscow, but there appears to be no evidence of a split below the Politburo level. The rank and file party members are concentrating on exploiting the economic misery. Nor is there any sign that Peking is attempting to steer the PKI into military opposition to the Sukarno regime, a move which, now at least, probably would be as disastrous for the party as was the Stalin-ordered revolution here in the early post-World War II years.

The press in Indonesia is a disgrace by any democratic standard. News of the outside world is at a minimum and often is quite slanted. Newsprint is imported and publishers are under the government's heel. In this capital of Djakarta, with a population estimated at 3 million, the 15 papers have a combined circulation of 360,000, of which the five Communist or far left papers have about half the total.

The radio is state-owned. Television, which Indonesia can ill afford but which is a status symbol, has begun in Djakarta, where there are an estimated 10,000 imported TV sets.

This is not a land for dissent by any democratic standard. Dissent runs afoul of the Sukarno philosophy of government, which is based on the ancient village system of consensus and which therefore has wide public appeal.

Marxist terminology abounds. When Sukarno received an honorary degree February 2 at the University of Indonesia here, he was praised for having denounced "individualism, liberalism, capitalism, imperialism, feudalism, fascism as sources of exploitation of man by man." Communism was missing from the list. Any enemy of Indonesia will quickly be branded as an imperialist or neo-colonialist or capitalist.

Some of this is explicable for reasons other than the power of the nations' Communist Party. As able American Ambassador Howard P. Jones, a man with 7 years' experience here, recently put it in a speech: "To the majority of Indonesians—in fact to most of the newly emerging peoples of the African and Asian world—the word 'capitalism' brings forth an immediate and vivid picture of foreign control of their economy and, not infrequently, of foreign exploitation and oppression."

The Dutch, who exploited the wealth of the Indies during 300 years of rule, are still unpopular although some Indonesians want enough of them to come back to help revitalize the largely Dutch-built farm and factory equipment. The Japanese, who occupied the country from 1942 to 1945, are looked upon as liberators from the Dutch.

Those who worry publicly about communism in Indonesia are accused of having a Communist phobia. The more democratic leaders will tell you, as foreign observers also do, that the PKI's power is balanced by the military, which is rated as highly anti-Communist.

Large numbers of army, navy and air force officers have been to the United States and the resulting friendship, from the sample I have had, is impressive. The same can be said for the several thousand students and technicians who have been sent to the United States.

Indonesians talk a lot about their poorness despite their great wealth of little-tapped resources, which include the biggest oil source in Asia, much rubber, copra, tin, and other items. In moments of frankness, they

will say they have their hands out to both East and West—and that they expect to have their wants met.

The people, of course, are the greatest resource. They are not as aggressive as the Japanese nor as hard-working as the many Chinese among them, on whom they look with suspicion and often with envy despite the official Indonesian friendship with Red China. Yet Indonesians are industrious; they must be to survive, especially in Java, the most crowded major area in the world after Belgium.

They are not naturally very adept mechanically but they are trying, or at least the upper echelon is trying, to propel the nation into the 20th century industrial revolution. Sukarno has in motion, at least, a massive education program with three shifts in the schools. But the lacks are everywhere—trained teachers, buildings, books, paper. And it costs the university student far more to board than to study.

Indonesia's problem today quite obviously is to get its economic house in order. Perhaps the optimists are right and the necessary moves will now be made. But the pessimists are correct in demanding to see the evidence.

One would be more of an optimist, despite the nation's obvious shortcomings and the massive power of the Communists, if it were not for the lurking suspicion that Sukarno would prefer another foreign policy adventure. The row with Malaya over the British colonial possessions along the northern fringe of Borneo is the subject for another article.

Then, too, the Portuguese hold half of the island of Timor, an anachronism which Indonesians hint they will get around to in due course. To many, Sukarno is a permanent revolutionary who needs such foreign issues to keep his momentum.

In short, this is an attractive yet often baffling nation where many are seeking real progress but where the machinery of government "socialism" is clearly inadequate to the need. Indonesia's future is questionable, yet it is full of vital people who are trying to shed the colonial past with all its inhibitions in order to come to grips with the future.

FOREIGN POLICY SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, as long as our foreign policy is conducted along the lines of an "experimental baker's school," I am sure that our allies and enemies alike will be completely confused as to exactly what our objectives are, both from a long-range standpoint and in the cold war. Political allegiance rather than foreign policy experience seems to be the key to the "confused frontier."

Constantine Brown in an article published in the Evening Star on Thursday, February 28, reports in shocking terms the reaction our allies throughout the free world and in particular Western Europe have to the foreign policy gyrations of the present administration.

I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN POLICY SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES—EUROPEANS FEEL THAT TOO MANY COOKS ARE INVOLVED IN DECISIONS, WRITER SAYS

(By Constantine Brown)

ROME.—The saying that too many cooks spoil the broth applies these days to diplo-

macy. Over the last 2 years this reporter has seen dozens of high and low American Government officials, legislators and mere friends of the administration roaming over Europe at the taxpayers' expense on various kinds of special diplomatic missions. They insist on seeing the highest in the land and then make special reports to the White House. It is probable that their impressions add to the confusion in Washington.

According to the Constitution, the President of the United States is alone responsible for the country's foreign policy; the Secretary of State is his executive officer. Until the advent of the New Frontier the various Presidents followed the Constitution and tradition. President Franklin Roosevelt was his own Secretary of State during his four terms, although the counsels of his right hand man, Harry Hopkins, did often prevail over those of Cordell Hull, particularly during the war. Mr. Hull was often belatedly informed about momentous decisions.

During John Foster Dulles' 6 years as President Eisenhower's Secretary of State, he was the real policymaker. The attempts of the President's brother, Dr. Milton Eisenhower, to influence foreign policies were successful only in regard to Latin America. There were no other "cooks" in the White House to spoil the international broth, since Harold Stassen's efforts to have a voice in African diplomacy and on disarmament were ignored. President Eisenhower relied completely on Mr. Dulles.

Now when President Kennedy speaks and apparently makes his own decisions they are suspected as being the result of advice from half a dozen theoreticians, mostly inexperienced in practical international affairs, who vie with each other to guide our destinies. This at least is the overall impression of responsible statesmen in Europe who watch American international gyrations with concern because they concern them directly.

The consensus in the principal European capitals is that Secretary of State Dean Rusk, given a real chance, could become "another Dulles." He possesses many of Mr. Dulles' qualities and is regarded as frank, understanding, and trustworthy. But as a high official put it to this reporter: "Mr. Rusk is uncertain of himself because he does not carry the necessary weight in Washington."

There are many other intimate advisers who are closer to the elbow and ears of President Kennedy than Mr. Rusk. In discussions with foreign ministers or heads of state Mr. Rusk makes no commitments—as Mr. Dulles so often did—because of fear that "the others" in the White House may disagree with his sound judgment and thus he may be overruled by Mr. Kennedy on advice of pedagogic counselors.

The bloopers made in recent months by the administration are blamed by European statesmen more on "too many cooks" in the White House than on the President himself and Mr. Rusk.

It is in reference to these cooks that well-informed General de Gaulle reportedly gave Mr. Kennedy the fatherly advice, "My dear young friend; always make your own decision," at the Elysee in 1961.

In Europe foreign policy decisions, good or bad, are made exclusively by those responsible for their acts. The special adviser system is unknown here.

Nobody will deny that General de Gaulle follows a policy line determined by himself. It is based on a thorough study of situations.

Like General de Gaulle, but to a somewhat lesser extent, Prime Minister Macmillan is also his own Secretary of State. Lord Home gives counsel more frequently than his French opposite number. Had the British Prime Minister consulted his Foreign Secretary before he made the mistake of losing his temper publicly when Britain's entry into the Common Market was blocked by General de Gaulle, his political position would not have been jeopardized.

Until the Spiegel affair rocked the Bonn government, Chancellor Adenauer was very much his own Secretary of State. Since then he has been wavering between his personal convictions and political expediency. But even so, the Germans, like the rest of the Europeans, have either none or a very small number of cooks preparing the international broth.

MANAGEMENT OF NEWS BY KENNEDY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask for unanimous consent to include in the body of the RECORD a news release issued by my office on February 27 concerning the management of news by the Kennedy administration. Along with this insertion, I would like to include an article by Constantine Brown from the Saturday, February 2, issue of the Evening Star which is most informative as to the present status of our prestige abroad.

There being no objection, the news release and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The management of the news has reached the point of ridiculousness. The USIA, after much prodding, has a scheme whereby it will release a handful of carefully selected polls designed to show that U.S. prestige was low at the end of the Eisenhower administration. These are the only polls released on the prestige of the United States. Two other polls of 2 years ago turned on the prestige of the Executive and the unfavorable attitudes of Castro.

This is not what the country has been asking for. If the news were not being carefully managed, these polls would have been accompanied by at least some evidence on the rise and fall of American prestige during the whole period of the past 2 years. Such release should certainly be made without the flimsy excuses that sources would be imperiled or security involved.

This administration is determined not to expose anything about how it was doing abroad and relies on a continual campaign to blame all its troubles on the Eisenhower administration. I do not see how any respected newsmaker could be content with "all we can tell you is how things happened before we got here." The policy of releasing news after 2 years means that about October 22, 1964, there will be a release geared to the total public bipartisan support of actions relating to Cuba around October 22, 1962. This combination of news management for political advantage helps the party in power but conceals from the American public the ups and downs of reactions to our foreign policy.

THE LUSTER OF U.S. STATESMANSHIP—SOME FADING IS NOTED AMONG EUROPEANS WHO FIND OUR "MEDDLING" DISTASTEFUL

(By Constantine Brown)

ROME.—During the 1960 campaign candidate Kennedy and his aids complained that the American image had suffered much throughout the world through mishandling of international affairs by the Eisenhower administration. He promised, if elected, to restore American prestige. After a short upsurge, the American image is now at a low ebb with rank and file Europeans.

President Kennedy's inauguration speech, filled with electrifying words and promises of great things, plus his own youth and personality, charm and vigor, took Europe by storm. "Let both sides be united to heed in all corners of the earth the command of Isaiah—to 'undo the heavy burdens' . . . (and) let the oppressed go free," were words of hope everywhere in the world. "Let every

other power know that this hemisphere intends to remain the master of its own house," were fair words of warning to Fidel Castro and Nikita Khrushchev.

But the words had hardly faded from memory when came the disastrous Bay of Pigs invasion in Cuba. And while that pot was still boiling the Berlin wall was erected and the oppressed were locked behind it. Only stern protests came from Washington.

But the following year the world took heart when again the ringing, strong words of President Kennedy announced that the United States would take firm action if Mr. Khrushchev did not remove missiles and bombers from Cuba. But Cuba still remains a strong Soviet bastion in the American Hemisphere, a threat to every Latin American country and thus to the United States itself.

Crowding out the De Gaulle veto of Britain's entry into the Common Market and his refusal to join in NATO's nuclear arms force is the administration's fumbling recovery from the De Gaulle pronouncements. President Kennedy promised Polaris submarines in exchange for the removal of the Jupiter bases in Italy and Turkey. These subs eventually were to be manned by multinational crews. On second thought, it was realized that beyond the difficulty of handling crews speaking different languages, each Polaris sub needed five crews for rotation; that Polaris subs remained under water for 2 months at a time; and, that 5 years were needed to train the crews.

It was then proposed that the missiles be placed on surface ships, which several European navy men pointed out are as vulnerable as land-based missiles. At about that time it was reported in the European press that the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee was bringing to the attention of the administration that the McMahon Act prohibited the United States giving atomic warheads to other countries. Perhaps this confusion results from what Secretary of State Rusk complains about: So many of the Presidential aids and friends in key policy planning roles send conflicting orders "from the President himself."

This reporter has recently heard complaints from a number of highly placed Europeans that while they appreciate America's help in getting them on their feet after the war, they do not appreciate the present tendency of Washington to meddle in their affairs. In fact, they now say that America needs their help for financial support to keep the dollar at the present rate of exchange.

There is a strong feeling here that our insistence that NATO nations increase their forces by at least another six or seven divisions is not based on actual military necessity but to procure the necessary weapons from the United States for gold. Germany already has pledged herself to purchase \$750 million worth of ordnance in the United States during this and the next year. Italy has contracted for \$125 million worth this year and an additional \$350 million in the next few years.

While the direct inmixture of the United States into the quarrels of European states has been applauded by the governments in London, Rome, Brussels, and The Hague, the European press reflects the thinking of the people who find our "meddling" distasteful. Here in Italy politicians see that Washington is doing everything possible to help Prime Minister Fanfani remain in office. And our meddling will certainly be an issue in the April Italian elections. Most Italians do not want the Polaris missile submarines to have an Italian base and already cartoons are appearing showing Mr. Fanfani telling the people there "are no Polaris" while hiding them behind a screen.

The popularity of Americans in Europe is as high as ever, but the luster of American statemanship has faded.

KNOWLAND KEYNOTES CALIFORNIA REPUBLICAN MEETING

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on February 23, former U.S. Senator William F. Knowland, now editor and publisher of the Oakland, Calif., Tribune, delivered the keynote address to the California Republican Assembly Dinner held in the Disneyland Hotel. His address merits the careful reading and consideration of all Republicans—whether domiciled in California or elsewhere in this Republic.

Bill Knowland, as we who served with him all know him, holds the rare distinction of being one of the few Republican Senators to have served both as a majority leader and as a minority leader of the U.S. Senate. He served his country well in both these capacities during the Eisenhower administration before Knowland voluntarily retired from the Senate.

Because of Bill Knowland's profound and intimate knowledge of Washington affairs and the political developments of our era his counsel to the California Republicans is especially important. So that all who are interested may read his remarks, I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the body of the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Fellow Californians, since this Republican assembly was organized three decades ago we have gone through many political battles together. We have tasted both the champagne of victory and the vinegar of defeat.

In that time, by my reckoning, we have been on the winning side in 2 of 7 presidential elections, 5 of 8 gubernatorial campaigns, and 8 out of 10 contests for U.S. Senator. During this period of 30 years, the founders have aged from young men in our twenties or early thirties, to the middle fifties or early sixties.

To the young men and women who have since joined our ranks, I can assure you that the passing of these years has not dimmed our dedication to the cause of good government in California and in the Nation.

If history teaches anything, it is that men and women must be prepared to fight for principles even though victory may come not to them but to their successors.

Those who died on Bunker Hill, at Concord, and at Lexington were not present to share the thrill of the British surrender at Yorktown, nor did the victims of Pearl Harbor, Bataan, and Corregidor share the magnitude of the capitulation aboard the *Missouri*. But there were some who survived in each case to see defeat turn to victory.

So it has been in many a political campaign in our Nation. The 1856 defeat of John C. Fremont as the first Republican nominee for President laid the foundation for the election of Abraham Lincoln 4 years later.

Lincoln, himself, tasted defeat at the hands of Stephen A. Douglas for the office of U.S. Senator in 1858 only to, in turn, defeat Douglas for the Presidency in 1860.

We must always try to keep a proper perspective on the events of the moment. The tide of history moves and mere man does not always know what destiny may hold in store 2 or 4 years hence—nor does a political party or a nation.

I am vitally interested in the future of the Republican Party because I am concerned for the future of the United States. Our

form of government cannot continue without an effective two-party system.

The Republican Party is the only mechanism available to give effective opposition to the present administration in 1964. We must pull the party together and not join in the prevalent pastime of tearing it apart.

There are millions of dedicated conservatives who belong to no organization other than the Republican or Democratic Parties. They are needed and have no intention of being liquidated from political activity.

Every time a conservative leader arises there is an attempted smear to tar him as a reactionary or a member of the Birch Society, regardless of the facts in the case. This is the "guilt by association" technique the liberals bitterly objected to during the investigations by Senator Joseph McCarthy. Now, some Republicans are emulating the liberal Democrats.

There are millions of dedicated liberals (some of the Jeffersonian tradition) who resent being blanketed in with the ADA or the more extreme left wing elements that operate in this country.

We need the dedicated conservatives and liberals who can find room for agreement in saving this Nation from having a bankrupt Federal Government which dominates our economy and submerges our State governments.

Republicans won a substantial victory in the First Congressional District on January 22. DON CLAUSEN (who was Del Norte chairman of my first senatorial campaign in 1946) won a resounding victory with a margin of 14,000. He won in a district with a democratic registration lead of 14,000. He won in an area that had been represented by the late Democratic Congressman Clem Miller, since 1959.

This was the first congressional district election in the Nation since the general elections of last year and it has attracted widespread national attention. With qualified candidates and dedicated workers this pattern can be repeated in other areas of our State and Nation.

There is no reason for either Republican defeatism or complacency as a result of the November 6, 1962, elections. From a national point of view the election was spotty. Strong Republican trends were apparent in some areas whereas in nearby States the tide was running toward the Democrats.

Certainly we are realistic enough to recognize that the President is entitled to satisfaction in that his congressional majority, from a partisan Democratic point of view, improved in an off year election for the first time since 1934.

It is my judgment, however, that the 88th Congress will not be a rubberstamp for the President any more than the expired 87th Congress.

For this the country can be thankful. Article I of the Constitution gives all of the legislative power to Congress. If Congress is to remain a coordinate branch of the Government it must not become subordinate to any President—Republican or Democrat.

Party organization is important. We cannot wait until 1964 to organize for victory in the presidential election of that year. Now is the time to start. In every State the young men and women must be brought into positions of importance and responsibility. Without constant infusion of new blood, any political organization will wither on the vine.

I have a strong feeling that in 1964 the public will be looking for men with principles and party platforms that mean what they say. The party that can inspire the interest and dedicated support of the millions who stayed at home in 1962 can win the election of 1964.

As far as 1964 is concerned, the Democrats will renominate President Kennedy. The Republican Party has a number of potential candidates whose names immediately come

to mind. In the next year others will move into national prominence. They may come from among the presently lesser-known Governors, Senators, Members of the House, or out of the business and professional life of the Nation.

In 1938 and 1939 a reading of the newspapers of those days would indicate that the next Republican presidential nominee of 1940 would be Senator Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, or District Attorney Thomas E. Dewey. It was not until the nomination year of 1940 that Wendell Willkie loomed on the horizon as a formidable contender who took the nomination from the two "professionals."

At the present time the names (in alphabetical order) of those receiving most national attention are: Barry Goldwater, U.S. Senator from Arizona; Mark O. Hatfield, Governor of Oregon, reelected to second term; Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of New York, elected to second term; George Romney, Governor of Michigan; William F. Scranton, Governor of Pennsylvania, Member of House of Representatives 87th Congress.

In addition, there may well be a large number of "favorite son" candidates whose States will want to hold their votes intact until the picture clarifies.

The year 1964 may be one of those years that could result in the emergence of a "Dark Horse" as was the case of James A. Garfield, Member of Congress from Ohio, and Senator-elect who was chosen on the 36th ballot as a compromise between Grant, Blaine, and Sherman.

There were a number of very close elections in 1962, in Minnesota, Rhode Island, and South Dakota the final results were not known for several weeks after the election.

Republicans replaced Democrats as Governors in Colorado, Michigan, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Wyoming, and Rhode Island.

Democrats replaced Republicans in Hawaii, Iowa, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Mexico and Vermont. A little more effort could have changed the result in these and a number of other States that were carried by the Democrats.

Organization was important in 1962 and it will remain important in the elections of 1964.

It is time for the Nation to regroup so that the people will have a clear-cut choice and not be led by either leaders or parties down paths that violate their fundamental beliefs and principles.

It is my strong belief that the Republicans should make a major effort to carry the South in 1964 and thereafter. I strongly believe that we could carry Florida, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Alabama, Kentucky, and Texas in the southern area. There are several other possibilities as well.

The South, the Midwest, and the additional States we will win on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts would give the Republicans a majority in the electoral college. While we would intend to carry in 1964 both New York and California, the Southern States mentioned would permit us to win without either the first and second State in population.

Without the South, the Republicans cannot win unless they have New York and California or at least as a minimum, one of these States.

The Kennedy administration has struck out in the domestic ball game and in the international one as well. As a great Democrat, Al Smith, said: "Let's look at the record." In 1960 Candidate Kennedy said: "I believe in the balanced budget and the only conditions on which I would unbalance the budget would be if there were a grave national emergency or a serious recession."

In his state of the Union message, President Kennedy was optimistic about world conditions and also stated that "America

has enjoyed 22 months of uninterrupted economic recovery." Yet President Kennedy presents a budget with a \$10 billion deficit which may well reach \$15 billion by the time of the nominating conventions next year.

When President Eisenhower left office in January of 1961 our historic close relations with our neighbor, Canada, were firm, our entente with France was cordial, and our understanding with Great Britain was friendly and clear.

In the last 60 days we disturbed our understandings with Great Britain by our unilateral termination of the Skybolt program; we have upset the friendly relations with France, our oldest ally since Lafayette and the Revolutionary War; and our lack of diplomacy has deeply shocked our good neighbor, Canada and plunged them into an election where "pulling the eagle's feathers" may turn out to be as popular as "twisting the lion's tail" was at one time in our own country.

The "whiz kids" have certainly established their amateur standing in foreign policy dealings with our friends.

Now let's look at our opponents: Last October we had apparently won a real victory in Cuba, Khrushchev was caught with his missiles showing. We had a united country, unanimity among our Latin American nations, full support of our Western Allies, and the power to gain a decisive settlement of the Cuban question. Let's look at the Cuban situation now compared to last October. Defeat was snatched by the "whiz kids" out of the jaws of victory.

1. We backed down on our demand for on-the-ground inspection of missile sites and potential missile hiding places.

2. We failed to board and examine the cargoes of Soviet ships with canvas-covered objects purporting to be missiles.

3. We failed to get Soviet agreement for the immediate withdrawal of all Soviet armed forces from Cuba. Four months later the administration throws the Nation a Kremlin sop that "some of these troops will be withdrawn." The American policy should be that every Soviet soldier be promptly removed from Cuba.

I refuse to accept the doctrine that we are helpless (short of armed conflict) to act in a decisive manner to get these Soviet troops out of Cuba. We could, in conjunction with the Organization of American States:

(a) Announce that if they were not all out by April 1, a tight naval and air blockade around Cuba would be instituted.

(b) The entire Organization of American States could notify the Soviet Union that diplomatic relations would be suspended as of that date and all Soviet embassies closed until the last Soviet soldier left Cuba.

I doubt the Soviet Union would want this to happen since Soviet embassies are centers of Soviet espionage and Communist propaganda in Latin America, as they are elsewhere in the world.

4. By the latter fatal oversight the Kennedy administration has for the first time in our history made the Monroe Doctrine a dead letter and has given tacit acquiescence to the establishment of a hostile Soviet base with approximately 20,000 troops just 90 miles from our shores.

For the first time in our history a responsible member of the administration has advocated "managed news" and enunciated the doctrine that it is proper on occasion to lie to the American people.

From now on during the remaining 20 months of this administration the public will be in doubt as to when they are being lied to and when they are being told the truth.

In his inaugural speech, the next Republican President on January 20, 1965, should make it clear that deceit will not be tolerated and the word of an administration official will be as good as his bond.

Only in this way can confidence be restored and a free people be assured they can make their decisions based on facts as they are and not as colored by officials assuming a papa-knows-best attitude.

This administration is striving to enlarge the executive power at the expense of the legislative power. It must be stopped in its tracks.

During the previous Congress the President compared Congress to Lazarus. If Congress dies, even temporarily, the Constitution dies with it. Congress is indeed no Lazarus and the President is no Saviour.

The time has come to take our stand in meaningful support of the Constitution.

1. We cannot permit an all powerful Federal Government that can overpower, submerge, and destroy the functions of our 50 State governments.

2. We cannot permit an all powerful Executive that can overshadow the legislative and judicial branches of our Government.

3. We cannot permit any world government to overpower, submerge, and destroy our constitutional form of government and the Bill of Rights of our people.

4. Excessive Government costs and taxes must be reduced to preserve the system of private enterprise. Among the essential steps is a drastic reduction in foreign aid where American enterprise is being taxed to provide an endless cornucopia to the socialist and neutralist nations of the world.

5. We must insist that the American people be protected from domination by big government, big business, or big labor. No man or no group of men must be allowed to have the power to strangle the economic life of our Nation, our State, or our community.

6. Civil rights must be respected but civil rights are far more extensive than racial rights alone. The right to own property and to dispose of it, to walk in safety on our streets to and from work, to have a job, to engage in a business or profession, are also civil rights entitled to the protection of government—National, State, and local.

Equality for the Negro will come when we stop treating him as a minority voting pressure group, to whom promises are often made and seldom kept—and we treat him as an individual American citizen who has the same rights, interests, and obligations of citizenship that the balance of our people have.

7. Education is and should remain the primary function of local and State government. We must resist the encroachment of the Federal Government in the field of education.

8. The constitutional separation of church and state does not require taking God out of government or out of our personal lives. Prayers were said in our Constitutional Convention and are said in our National and State legislative bodies. Prayers have been said in our inaugural ceremonies and the Bible is used for the Presidential oath.

At home we must not permit big government, big business, or big labor to so overshadow the individual that he loses his identity and becomes a mere statistic on an electric tape.

The individual must not willingly surrender nor have forcibly taken from him the control over his conscience and his power of decision in matters moral, economic, or political.

For this is what the American heritage is and what the American Revolution was about.

The real, deep, moving, powerful (yes, irresistible) strength of our Nation comes from the free and undominated convictions of men and women, old and young, rich and poor, native and foreign born, educated and unschooled, who have a deep faith in America and a belief in Almighty God.

PAYMENT IN LIEU OF TAXES BY HAWAII HOUSING AUTHORITY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, during the morning hour, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 345, which is Calendar No. 11, and which has been cleared by the minority and majority leaders.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 345) to provide for the approval of a payment in lieu of taxes to be made for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, by the Hawaii Housing Authority to the city and county of Honolulu.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on passage of the bill. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law or any contract or rule of law, the Public Housing Commissioner shall approve a payment in lieu of taxes to be made for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, in the amount of \$24,167.78, by the Hawaii Housing Authority to the city and county of Honolulu.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a brief statement in explanation of the bill be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

S. 345 would require the Public Housing Commissioner to approve a payment in lieu of taxes in the amount of \$24,167.78 made by the Hawaii Housing Authority to the city and county of Honolulu, with respect to housing projects HA-1, HA-2, and HA-3 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959.

This payment was disallowed by the Public Housing Administration because it was made after the expiration of the time limit set for such payments in the annual contributions contract between the Hawaii Housing Authority and the Public Housing Administration. The contract provided that no voluntary payments in lieu of taxes may be made more than 1 year after the end of the fiscal year to which they apply. The payment which was disallowed was made on July 9, 1960, 9 days after the final permissible date, which, in this case, was June 30, 1960.

BACKGROUND

This restriction on voluntary payment in lieu of taxes was included in the contributions contracts with local agencies which have not contracted through cooperation agreements to make specific payments to their localities. The restriction was designed to prevent the excessive accumulation of potential expenditures, and to relate payments to the periods in which the city's services were rendered.

In opinion B-125637 (35 Comp. Gen. 345), dated December 7, 1955, the Comptroller General ruled that adherence to the time limit may not be waived by the Public Housing

Agency. The summary of this decision stated:

"The establishment of time limitations for payments in lieu of taxes in annual contributions contracts between the Public Housing Administration and local housing authorities is a proper exercise of administrative discretion and the Public Housing Administration is proscribed from waiving such contract conditions to permit a local housing authority to make payments after the expiration of the limitation."

The Housing Act of 1956, section 408 (70 Stat. 1108), provided relief for 11 housing authorities affected by the above-cited ruling, and the Housing Act of 1961, section 907 (75 Stat. 191), provided relief for another. When the Housing Act of 1956 was before the Congress for consideration, the Housing and Home Finance Agency assured the appropriate committees that it would not support special legislation of this type in the future.

In two circulars dated May 17 and June 14, 1956, the Public Housing Administration called to the attention of all local housing authorities the Comptroller General's decision and warned them not to expect special legislative relief if in the future payments in lieu of taxes were not made within the time period specified in the contributions contract. The local housing authorities were advised either to amend their cooperation agreements with local towns to provide for mandatory payments, or to be careful not to exceed the time limit on any future voluntary payments.

The Administrator concluded that although the enactment of this legislation would be reflected in an additional contribution payment by the Federal Government "in view of the foregoing, we believe that it is a matter for Congress to determine whether relief should be granted under the circumstances of this case."

AGENCY COMMENTS

In a letter addressed to the chairman of the committee by the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, commenting on an identical bill, S. 2627, which was pending before the committee in the 87th Congress, the Administrator stated:

"The present case is * * * a matter of oversight, and one involving failure to make proper payment by only a few days. In his letter of January 3, 1961, requesting waiver of the contract provisions, the acting executive director of the Hawaii Housing Authority pointed out that 'the contract violations are technical, that they were not intended, and resulted from an oversight.'"

The comments of the Bureau of the Budget and the Comptroller General of the United States follow:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,

Washington, D.C., February 5, 1963.

HON. JOHN L. MCLELLAN,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your request for our views regarding the provisions of S. 345, to provide for the approval of a payment in lieu of taxes to be made for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, by the Hawaii Housing Authority to the city and county of Honolulu.

The bill would require the Public Housing Commissioner to approve the \$24,167.78 payment in lieu of taxes made by the Hawaii Housing Authority to the city and county of Honolulu with respect to housing projects HA-1, HA-2, and HA-3 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959. The enactment of this legislation would be reflected in an additional contribution payment by the Public Housing Administration to the Hawaii Housing Authority.

The payment in question was disallowed by the Public Housing Administration because it was made 9 days after expiration of

the time limit set for such payments in the annual contributions contracts between the Administration and the Hawaii Housing Authority. It appears that the violation in this case resulted from an oversight on the part of the Hawaii Housing Authority and is technical in nature. The Comptroller General has ruled, however, that adherence to the time limit may not be waived by that Administration.

If, despite the notice and warning by the Public Housing Administration to all local housing units concerning the exact situation covered by S. 345, your committee believes that relief should be granted, the Bureau of the Budget would not object to favorable action on the bill.

Sincerely yours,

PHILLIP S. HUGHES,
Assistance Director for Legislative Reference.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND IN ARKANSAS TO CITY OF FAYETTEVILLE, ARK.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 13, Senate bill 13.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 13) to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain land situated in the State of Arkansas to the city of Fayetteville, Ark.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations, with amendments, on page 1, at the beginning of line 4, to strike out "General Services" and insert "Veterans' Affairs"; on page 2, line 4, after the word "the", to strike out "fifty-sixth" and insert "fifth"; and in line 22, after the word "of", to strike out "General Services" and insert "Veterans' Affairs"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, subject to section 2 of this Act, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, to the city of Fayetteville, Arkansas, for park and recreational purposes, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following described tract of land, which constitutes a portion of certain lands heretofore conveyed by such city to the United States without consideration, and which has been declared surplus to the needs of the United States: A tract of land situated in the county of Washington, State of Arkansas, being part of the northeast quarter of section 9, township 16 north, range 30 west, of the fifth principal meridian, and being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the northeast corner of section 9; thence south along the east line of said section 9, 660 feet to a point; thence west 165 feet to a point; thence south 100 feet to a point; thence west 733 feet to a point; thence north 350 feet to a point; thence west 435 feet to a point; thence north 410 feet to a point on the north line of section 9; thence east along the north line of said section 9, 1,333 feet to the point of beginning; and containing 19.382 acres, more or less.

SEC. 2. The land authorized to be conveyed by the first section of this Act shall

be conveyed subject (1) to the condition that it shall be used for park and recreational purposes in a manner which, in the judgment of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, will not interfere with the care and treatment of patients in the Veterans' Administration hospital situated on lands adjacent to the land herein authorized to be conveyed, and (2) to the condition that in the event that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs determines, within twenty years after the date of execution of such conveyance, that the land so conveyed has been devoted to any use other than for park and recreational purposes, all right, title, and interest therein shall revert to and revert in the United States in its then existing condition, and (3) to the gas easement which was granted to the Arkansas Western Gas Company (for a period of fifty years) by the Department of the Army.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land situated in the State of Arkansas to the city of Fayetteville, Arkansas."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD a brief statement on the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 13, as introduced, would have authorized and directed the Administrator of General Services to convey the property covered by this measure to the city of Fayetteville by quitclaim deed, without compensation, and to be responsible for making any determination regarding the operation of a reverter in favor of the United States in the event the conditions of the conveyance were not met by the donee of the property. The bill also gives the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs general responsibility to insure that the operation of the property by the donee, for park and recreational purposes, would not interfere with the care and treatment of patients in the VA hospital located adjacent to the land authorized to be conveyed.

Inasmuch as the Veterans' Administration is the agency directly concerned, by virtue of its maintenance of a hospital adjacent to the property involved, the committee deems it more appropriate to lodge all responsibility imposed by this bill with that agency. The amendments, therefore, merely substitute the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs as the transferring agency for the Administrator of General Services, as well as the administering agency, and make a correction in the description of the property.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, to the city of Fayetteville, Ark., for park and recreational purposes, all right, title, and interest of the United States in about 19 acres of surplus land, which constitutes part of a larger tract of land originally donated by the city of Fayetteville to the United States as a site for a veterans' hospital.

BACKGROUND

Except for the amendments noted above, S. 13 is identical to the amended version of S. 1412, 87th Congress, which the committee reported favorably on July 17, 1961 (S. Rept. 546, 87th Cong.), and the Senate

passed on July 20, 1961. S. 1412 was referred to the House Committee on Government Operations on July 24, 1961, but no further action was taken on the measure.

The land proposed to be returned to the city of Fayetteville is a portion of an original tract containing about 82 acres, donated to the Federal Government by the city in 1932. It is reported that the city purchased the original tract at a cost of \$66,250. The portion of the original tract of land covered by the subject bill was reported excess to the needs of the Veterans' Administration on September 7, 1955. It was transferred to the Department of the Army on November 20, 1956, and used by the Arkansas National Guard for outdoor training. On September 2, 1960, the Department of the Army declared the land excess to its needs and referred it to the General Services Administration for disposal as surplus property.

Under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, the Administrator of General Services has authority to dispose of surplus realty to States and local governments at its fair market value, and if it is to be used for health, education, park or recreational purposes, a public benefit allowance may be made in the disposal of such property. Such conveyances shall be made at a price equal to 50 percent of the fair value of the property conveyed, based on the highest and best use of the property at the time it is offered for disposal. This authority may, however, be exercised by another agency which may have an interest in or be affected by the transfer when so designated by the GSA or by an act of Congress.

The city of Fayetteville sought to obtain this surplus property for use as a park, under the above provisions, but was unable to reconcile differences over the appraisal basis in subsequent negotiations with the General Services Administration, thus prompting the introduction of legislation to convey the property without consideration.

The city had independent appraisals made by three qualified local appraisers who valued the property at approximately \$10,000, if it is to be used for public purposes, as proposed by the city. Applying the 50-percent formula to this appraisal, the city would be required to pay only about \$5,000 for the land.

However, the GSA appraisal of the property was based on its highest and best use (residential) at \$20,000, which meant that the city would be required to pay \$10,000 under the public-benefit formula.

By letter of January 25, 1961, Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT advised this committee that the General Services Administration was in the process of offering the land for sale to the general public and requested that such sale be postponed until further negotiations could take place between the city and the General Services Administration on a fair price for the land. Senator FULBRIGHT also indicated his intention to introduce legislation to authorize conveyance of the property to the city without cost if further negotiations failed to result in an agreed price, since the property had been donated to the Government by the city.

In response to Senator FULBRIGHT's letter, the committee requested the General Services Administration to postpone disposition of this property until a satisfactory adjustment could be made or, if this did not develop, until legislation providing for the conveyance of the property to the city of Fayetteville without compensation could be introduced and considered by the committee.

Additionally, members of the committee staff met with representatives from General Services Administration and Senator FULBRIGHT's office in an effort to reach an agreement that would be satisfactory to the Administrator and to the city of Fayetteville. At that time the staff director, on behalf of the committee, requested the General Services Administration to seek a compromise on

the appraisal value of this property so that the city of Fayetteville might purchase the property at 50 percent of the fair market value, based on its use as a public park and not for residential purposes.

Subsequently, General Services Administration advised the committee, in a letter dated February 23, 1961, that it had requested its Dallas office to obtain another appraisal of the property in an effort to reconcile the aforementioned differentials in valuations. However, this reappraisal placed the value of the property at \$21,000, or \$1,000 more than the first appraisal by the General Services Administration, based on its use for residential purposes.

Thus the second evaluation by General Services Administration served only to widen the difference between the city and General Services Administration and prompted Hon. Guy E. Brown, mayor of Fayetteville, in a letter addressed to Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN, chairman of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, dated March 8, 1961, to comment as follows:

"The land in question was given to the Government several years ago by the city of Fayetteville, for the veterans' hospital. Since they did not use the land, it became surplus property. We thought that, in fairness to the city of Fayetteville, it should be given back to the city free of any charges.

"The General Services Administration office in Dallas called me the other day and stated that they had another appraisal made, and that the appraised value of the land was \$21,000, \$1,000 more than the first appraisal. This land is on a hillside, and there is a drop of 100 feet in the terrain from one side to the other. It can only be used for barbecue pits and picnic tables. Since we have no park in that part of town, we would like very much to have such a plot of ground for that purpose.

"We understand that we would receive the land for one-half of the appraised value, but we cannot see that it would be worth \$10,500 to the city, for barbecue pits and picnic tables.

"The city of Fayetteville would be most grateful to you, and to Senator FULBRIGHT and the other Senators, if you would introduce such legislation as would be necessary to give this land back to the city of Fayetteville."

In view of the failure of negotiations to achieve a satisfactory solution, Senator FULBRIGHT then introduced S. 1412, which was designed to return the property to the city without cost, subject to the conditions set forth therein. As noted above this measure passed the Senate during the 87th Congress, but was not enacted by the House of Representatives. The measure was then reintroduced in this session in the form of S. 13 by Senators FULBRIGHT and McCLELLAN.

CONCLUSION

If the statutory provision relating to the conveyance of surplus property to States and local governments under the public-benefit formula is applied in this instance, the city of Fayetteville would be required to pay one-half of a market value predicated on the property's use for residential purposes when, in fact, the city intends to use the land for park and recreational purposes and, under the terms of the bill, as amended, the city will be required to so use the land.

The committee feels that it would be unfair to apply this formula to a city which originally donated a tract of land more than four times the size of the property in question to the Federal Government. In view of the fact that the city donated this land, and now seeks but a small, unimproved, surplus portion of its original grant for use as a public park, the committee feels that a compelling case is made for the return of this property to the city of Fayetteville without compensation.

FREEDOM OF CHOICE IN VOTING FOR UNIONIZATION OF EM- PLOYEES

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, several days ago I sent a letter to the National Mediation Board, accompanied by a letter I received from a constituent in Ohio. This Ohio constituent, an employee of the United Air Lines, in his letter to me complained that in a ballot which was to be used in determining whether there shall be unionization of the employees, there was no separate space under which a worker could say, "No, I do not want to belong to a union." The ballot provided as follows:

1. Representation by the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks.
2. Representation by the I.A.M.
3. Representation by any other organization.

There was no space on the ballot which would allow the employee to say, "I do not want to belong to a union."

I wrote to the Mediation Board and pointed out that there was not the ability to express a free choice on the ballot. The only way the employee could express a free choice clearly would be to write into the ballot, himself, "I do not want to belong to a union."

In reply to my letter there came this interesting information: That a suit has been filed in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia known as Civil Action No. 402-63, on February 12, 1963. The issue will be determined in that lawsuit. However, if it is determined adversely to the view of those who say, "We want a ballot that will give us a chance to vote 'No' with the same facility as we can vote 'Yes'." I am of the belief that matters of such importance as this should eventually have the cognizance of Congress so it can enact necessary legislation to provide that there shall be open and free elections, with an opportunity for all views to be given and equal facility for expression.

I yield the floor.

DEPUTY CHIEF OF ARMS CONTROL AGENCY ANSWERS TEST BAN CRITICS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, over the past several weeks some of us seem to have been engaged in an undeclared war concerning the desirability of a nuclear test ban. The intensity of the conflict has risen in direct proportion to reports coming out of Geneva and elsewhere as to the likelihood of an agreement between the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union. With every sign of progress, starting with the publication of the exchange of letters between President Kennedy and Chairman Khrushchev, we have heard a steady counterpoint of comment—usually unfavorable to a test ban—from a variety of sources.

One of the most exhaustive of these comments was delivered in the Senate Chamber recently by my good friend and colleague, the senior Senator from Connecticut. I read the Senator's speech

with great care while flying cross country immediately after my arrival in the United States from the 18-nation disarmament talks in Geneva. I attended these talks, which dealt with the nuclear test ban issue, at the special invitation of the President. It was an enlightening, if sobering, experience. Nothing that happened there, and nothing that I read in the speech of the Senator from Connecticut, diminished my conviction that a nuclear test ban is essential from the point of view of U.S. security—not essential for the sake of some do-gooding principle of world morality and human brotherhood—however important those concepts are—but essential from the point of view of our national safety and well-being.

In this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald, there is a letter from Mr. Adrian Fisher, Deputy Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, which sets forth admirably the arguments in favor of a nuclear test ban—a test ban on terms commensurate with U.S. security and national interest. It answers point by point the chief criticisms of the Senator from Connecticut. I commend it to the attention of Senators, and ask unanimous consent that the letter and an accompanying front page news article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this week the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has scheduled some extremely important open hearings on matters relating to nuclear test detection capability. I shall be watching with great interest for reports on these hearings and on the remarks of the distinguished witnesses who are going to appear before the Committee.

I wish to announce in this connection that the Subcommittee on Disarmament, of which I am chairman, will hold hearings on the test-ban issue. Hearings will take place on Monday and Tuesday next week, March 11 and 12. To the extent possible, all sessions of the subcommittee will be open, and in any case all members of the Committee on Foreign Relations are cordially invited to attend. I can assure Senators that we will be going into both the technical and general policy aspects of a test ban, and no important consideration relative to United States policy is going to be swept under the rug.

In addition, I myself plan to take the floor tomorrow to present my own views and observations concerning the necessity of a nuclear test ban. The speech will explain in detail why I disagree with the view that a test ban is inimical to U.S. security. It will attempt to explain why I believe that a test ban containing adequate safeguards and backed up by the full panoply of rapidly advancing scientific and technical knowledge is definitely in the best interest of our country. I hope that all interested Senators will be present and will contribute their views to our thinking on this most important of world problems.

[EXHIBIT 1]

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 4, 1963]

A COMMUNICATION

On March 1 your newspaper carried a letter from the senior Senator from Connecticut, THOMAS J. DONN, in which he gave reasons why he believed the present U.S. position in the nuclear test-ban negotiations was unsound. It is with great reluctance that I find myself having to express a disagreement with the Senator, a respected lawmaker and a distinguished public servant. But since it is the firm view of the national security advisers to the President that an effective test-ban treaty is in the national interest and that our position at the negotiations is eminently sound, a few comments should be made with respect to the U.S. position and the points raised in the Senator's letter, as well as in his recent speech in the Senate.

1. The Senator stated that the test-ban policy pursued by both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations "has already cost us our nuclear superiority over the Soviets." The actual situation is quite different. The United States has not lost its nuclear superiority over the U.S.S.R. The trend with unlimited testing, however, in the absence of an agreement will be toward equality in the major nuclear forces between the United States and the U.S.S.R.

2. A test-ban agreement would inhibit nonnuclear powers from obtaining a nuclear weapons capability. The national interest of the United States is served more by a policy of inhibiting the proliferation of nuclear weapons than by a policy of being indifferent to the number of countries that may develop nuclear weapons of their own. A test-ban agreement would not in itself be sufficient to prevent the spread of independent national nuclear capability, but it would be a definite step in the right direction. This question of nonproliferation is one that must be included in any total appraisal of the importance of a test-ban agreement to the United States.

3. The Senator states that if the Soviets continue testing in secret under an agreement and we do not test, "they can confront us with a choice between surrender or annihilation." This is not correct. It is true that if the U.S.S.R. were able to test small devices clandestinely underground for an indefinite period, they could make significant advances in the general field of small nuclear weapons. However, every analysis conducted by the executive branch in recent years has reached the conclusion that the strategic military balance between the United States and the U.S.S.R. could not be altered in any major way by such developments. Furthermore, the risks of detection of a series of such tests would not be ignored by the U.S.S.R. One test would hardly be significant to a nation bent on attempting to gain a military advantage by testing secretly. Such a nation would more likely want to conduct a series of tests, and a series runs a much greater probability of detection than a single test. The risk of undetected cheating would be present under any treaty. The type of treaty prepared by the United States would provide deterrence against Soviet attempts at undetected cheating so that while such a risk must be recognized, on balance the security of the United States would be better served by taking this risk than taking the risk of continued unlimited testing with no agreement.

4. It is contended that the U.S. provisions for inspection and detection are only one-tenth as effective as those in our original proposals because the United States is now proposing fewer detection stations and fewer inspections. The monitoring system now proposed will have at least the same degree of deterrent effect as that contemplated 4

years ago. The original proposal of an internationally operated system of 180 control posts located in every geographic area of the world was made at a time when we had less knowledge about the detection and identification of underground events and was for a system designed to monitor the entire globe. On the basis of knowledge and experience of seismic events in the Soviet Union, we now know that the areas of interest can be monitored by a much smaller system which places primary reliance for the detection of events in the Soviet Union upon U.S. national systems located outside the Soviet Union. This is what we propose.

The original proposal would have required some 4 to 6 years to install and the international staff of technicians would have had to have been recruited and in many cases trained from scratch. Under the present proposal the United States would be relying on its own detection system which could begin operating immediately and which would be operated by United States and United Kingdom nationals who are already trained and skilled. This proposal would give the United States both maximum flexibility and maximum control of the detection system.

The previous proposal of the United States would have excluded from inspection underground events below a certain size—roughly, anything below a 20-kiloton explosion detonated in tuff, a relatively soft rock. And, at the same time, the United States would have agreed on a 3-year moratorium against conducting tests below this size. The present U.S. proposal would permit the United States to inspect, within the quota, for any underground event that had been detected and had not been positively identified as being an earthquake.

We also now know that the number of earthquakes in the U.S.S.R. is less by a factor of 2½ than we previously believed. This, coupled with our increased knowledge of earthquake identification, means that the number of unidentified underground events for which we might consider inspection, will be very substantially smaller than was assumed a few years ago. Furthermore, our knowledge in these areas is now based on actual observation whereas only a few years ago it was based in large part on uncertain estimates.

5. It is suggested that the United States now is willing to accept the principle that monitoring stations be manned by Russians and that Russians "are to be the judges of whether or not they themselves are cheating." Again, this is not a correct statement. The detection stations on which the United States would rely would be operated or supervised by the United States and United Kingdom and would be outside of the Soviet Union. No Soviet national would judge whether the Soviets are cheating. Automatic recording seismic stations inside the Soviet Union would play a supplementary role only; furthermore, the sealed recording devices which these would contain would be serviced and the records would be picked up by non-Soviet personnel.

6. It is said that we now propose to give the Communist bloc a veto power on the control body of the test-ban organization. No veto on inspection has ever been proposed by the United States, and there is no consideration of proposing such a veto in the future.

7. It is stated that William Foster, Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, testified in September that there had been no improvement in our verification capability. On the contrary, Mr. Foster testified in September concerning two significant developments which increased our verification capability. The first was a "better capability for long-distance detection

of earth tremors caused by nuclear explosions or earthquakes." The second was that "an earlier estimate of the number of tremors from earthquakes in the Soviet Union which might be confused with tremors from nuclear explosions has been shown by actual observations and research to be several times too large. Since there are fewer actual earthquakes which produce tremors similar to those of an explosion, the number of on-site inspections needed to identify the cause of any observed tremors is less." (Hearings before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, Sept. 17, 1962, p. 6.)

8. The Senator believes that continued testing is essential to the perfection of the antimissile missile and to the development of the neutron bomb, and that the nation which first perfects either of these weapons will decisively overturn the balance of power. These contentions were refuted generally in points 1-3 above. Additionally, the perfection of the antimissile missile does not rest primarily on nuclear weapons testing. It rests on other kinds of activities. Even then, our military experts are of the view that the nation sending a missile to its target will always have the advantage over any foreseeable antimissile missile defense system. With respect to the neutron bomb, a weapon whose successful development is by no means assured no matter how many tests are made, the chief interest of the United States is to prevent the Soviet Union and other states from acquiring this kind of a weapon. These states are much more likely to be inhibited from developing and producing the neutron bomb under a test-ban agreement than under a situation of unlimited testing.

The United States will continue to persist in its negotiations with the Soviets to achieve an effective treaty. We do this because we firmly believe such an agreement is in the national interest of the United States.

Every person weighing the value and the risks of a test-ban agreement must face squarely the situation in which we reach no agreements and allow testing to go on, unlimited, and see the arms race continue to spiral upward. Those within both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations who have studied these questions and these alternatives thoroughly have concluded that every effort to bring the arms race under control, of which nuclear testing is a part, must be pursued diligently.

I would hope that this letter demonstrates that the kind of test-ban agreement now being negotiated by the United States is one that is in the national interest.

ADRIAN S. FISHER,

U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

A-TEST BAN BID OF UNITED STATES DEFENDED—FISHER LEADS OFF FOR KENNEDY PRIOR TO POLICY SESSION

(By Laurence Stern)

The Kennedy administration jumped to the offensive yesterday against congressional critics who have been clamoring for a harder U.S. line in nuclear test-ban negotiations with the Soviet Union.

In the administration's first exchange of fire with Capitol Hill, Adrian S. Fisher, Deputy Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, challenged as not correct recent criticisms of test-ban policy by Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut.

Dodd and other congressional critics in both parties have expressed alarm that reductions in American demands for onsite inspection will permit the Soviet Union to achieve nuclear superiority through secret bomb tests.

Such concessions, Dodd argued, "have already cost us our nuclear superiority over the Soviets."

ISSUES REBUTTAL

Fisher yesterday issued a point-by-point rebuttal to this line of attack and argued instead that U.S. security can best be preserved with a test-ban treaty rather than in a no-holds-barred nuclear arms race.

In his letter to the Washington Post, Fisher replied to a letter from Dodd published in this newspaper last Friday. Fisher's letter is printed in full in today's editions.

Yesterday's opening skirmish foreshadowed a showdown on test-ban policy between the administration and its critics on Capitol Hill later this week. The forum for the debate probably will be a Joint Atomic Energy Committee hearing on Project Vera, the program for refining our underground nuclear blast detection techniques.

DEFENDS REDUCTION

Fisher defended the administration's lowering of annual onsite inspection demands from a starting point of 20 to a current proposal of 7 on the grounds that our knowledge of Soviet earthquake activity levels is more precise than it was several years ago.

Original U.S. inspection demands, he pointed out, were based on a 250-percent overestimate of the number of earthquakes in the U.S.S.R.

"This, coupled with our increased knowledge of earthquake identification, means that the number of unidentified underground events for which we might consider inspection will be very substantially smaller than was assumed a few years ago," Fisher wrote.

Yesterday's letter coincided with the return to Washington of Disarmament Agency Director William C. Foster from the deadlocked test-ban negotiations in Geneva. He is expected to brief the President today on the talks.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY HON. SUDHIR GHOSH, MEMBER OF INDIAN PARLIAMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, at this time I desire to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that we are privileged this afternoon to have as a distinguished visitor a fellow parliamentarian from the great nation of India. I call the attention of the Senate to the presence in this Chamber of Mr. Sudhir Ghosh, one of the most distinguished and able parliamentary leaders of the Parliament of India, a true friend of democracy and freedom, and a gentleman who enjoys the friendship of many Americans and many Members of this

body. Mr. Ghosh is a recognized leader in his country; a disciple of the late Mahatma Gandhi; a friend and adviser to Prime Minister Nehru. I wish to welcome him to the Senate.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to say I have had the pleasure of knowing Mr. Ghosh ever since 1952, when I first met him on a trip to India. I have had occasion to be with him on many occasions since then. I have found him to be an active, alert, devoted, patriotic Indian, and a very fine and dear friend of the West. He possesses much native ability. He was closely associated with the late Mahatma Gandhi, and was a student, or at least a disciple, of his. I think he still exhibits a great deal of the qualities which characterized Mr. Gandhi.

Several of us have just had the privilege of lunching together in the Foreign Relations Committee room, and we went over a good many of the questions which are of mutual concern and interest to both countries. I am delighted Mr. Ghosh is able to be here, and would welcome him every time he came.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am glad to join other Senators in welcoming a member of the House of the People, which is the elected house in India. I had the great honor and pleasure of knowing Mr. Ghosh in India. He is highly respected there. He is one of the strong leaders in the Congress Party and also in the House of the People. He has been here on several occasions. He has many friends among Members of this body and the other body of the Congress.

I concur in the statement that he is a great believer in and advocate of democratic institutions.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, 1963

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 10, House Joint Resolution 284.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 284) making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this measure will be handled on the floor by the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I understand that the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young], who is now in the Chamber, will be present to make any replies that may be requested by other Senators who are also here, and to join in the handling of the joint resolution.

I have a brief statement to make in regard to the pending measure.

The Appropriations Committee has acted promptly in its consideration of the supplemental budget request of \$508,172,000 for the Department of Agriculture. This amount is needed to enable the Commodity Credit Corporation to carry out its authorized programs for the balance of fiscal year 1963. In submitting the supplemental budget request—House Document No. 64—the President submitted an amendment to the 1964 budget request decreasing it by the same amount. In other words, the pending resolution, House Joint Resolution 284, deals solely with a shift in funding from the 1964 budget to providing these funds for fiscal 1963.

Over the years, Congress has enacted various laws under which the authorized borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation is to be used to finance costs incurred thereunder, subject to reimbursement appropriations. There is considerable misunderstanding with regard to the expenditures of the Commodity Credit Corporation versus the annual appropriations required to enable the Corporation to continue to carry out such authorized programs.

Today, we are dealing with just one aspect of the programs financed through the \$14.5 billion borrowing authorization available to the Commodity Credit Corporation. This resolution (H.J. Res. 284) deals only with title I of Public Law 480, under which sales of agricultural commodities are made for foreign currencies pursuant to the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, as amended. That, of course, is Public Law 480. The current legislative authorization for title I of Public Law 480 authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into agreements during the period beginning January 1, 1962, and ending December 31, 1964, which will call for appropriations to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation in a total amount not in excess of \$4,500 million. This legislative authorization provides that sales agreements shall not be entered into during any calendar year of the authorization period which will call for appropriations to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation in amounts in excess of \$2,500 million.

The various titles of Public Law 480 set the size of the programs for calendar year periods and the authorized reimbursement appropriations to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for costs incurred are usually made on a fiscal year basis.

The pending joint resolution is a supplemental item in this fiscal year.

The committee and the Congress have been dealing with these reimbursement appropriations for a number of years. I offer for the record a compilation of these legislative authorizations, and appropriation authority under which the Commodity Credit Corporation carries out these programs and is authorized to be reimbursed for the costs or the losses thereunder, and ask that it appear in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EDMONDSON in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REIMBURSEMENT FOR NET REALIZED LOSSES, OR COSTS, TO THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

PUBLIC LAW 480 PROGRAMS

Title I.—Sales of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies: Under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1701-1709), surplus agricultural commodities are sold for foreign currencies. Within certain limitations, these currencies may then be used by the U.S. Government for agricultural market development, purchase of strategic materials, military equipment, facilities and services for the common defense, payment of U.S. obligations, military housing, and other specified purposes.

Appropriation authority: Agricultural

The committee and the Congress Public Law 480, title I (7 U.S.C. 1703):

"(a) For the purpose of making payment to the Commodity Credit Corporation * * * for commodities disposed of and cost incurred under titles I and II of this act, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, etc. (b) Agreements shall not be entered into under this title during the period beginning January 1, 1962, and ending December 31, 1964, which will call for appropriations to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation in a total amount in excess of \$4,500 million: *Provided*, That agreements shall not be entered into during any calendar year of such period which will call for appropriations to reimburse Commodity Credit Corporation in amounts in excess of \$2,500 million."

Title II.—Commodities disposed of for emergency famine relief to friendly peoples: Under title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, Public Law 480, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1703, 1721-1724), the Commodity Credit Corporation makes its surplus stocks of agricultural commodities available to the President for famine relief and other assistance to friendly nations and friendly people in meeting famine or other relief requirements and to pay ocean freight charges for the shipment of donated commodities.

Appropriation authority: Public Law 480, title II (7 U.S.C. 1723), July 10, 1954 (sec. 203): "Programs of assistance shall not be undertaken under this title during any calendar year beginning January 1, 1961, and ending December 31, 1964, which call for appropriation of more than \$300 million to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for all costs incurred in connection with such programs." Public Law 480, title I (7 U.S.C. 1703(a)), July 10, 1954 (sec. 103a): "For the purpose of making payment to the Commodity Credit Corporation for commodities disposed of and costs incurred under Titles I and II of this Act, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums."

Title IV.—Long-term supply contracts: Under title IV of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act (7 U.S.C. 1731-1736), the President is authorized to make agreements with friendly nations under which the United States would deliver surplus agricultural commodities over periods of up to 10 years and accept payment in dollars with interest over periods of up to 20 years.

Appropriation authority: Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act—Public Law 480, title IV, as amended by Public Law 86-341 (7 U.S.C. 1736), September 21, 1959: "In carrying out this title, the provisions of section 103(a) shall be applicable to the extent not inconsistent with this title."

BARTERED MATERIALS FOR SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILE

Under current policy, the Commodity Credit Corporation acquires strategic and other materials through barter of price-support commodities only for other Government agencies or for transfer to a supplemental United States stockpile established by section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954. Transfers are valued at the lower of the domestic market price of the Commodity Credit Corporation's investment therein as of the date of transfer. The General Services Administration maintains the supplemental stockpile and transfers are made pursuant to their procedures.

Appropriation authority: Agricultural Act of 1956—Public Law 540, title II (70 Stat. 200) (7 U.S.C. 1856), May 28, 1956: "In order to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for materials transferred to the supplemental stockpile there are hereby authorized to be appropriated amounts equal to the value of any such materials so transferred. The value of any such material, for the purpose of this subsection, shall be the lower of the domestic market price or the Commodity Credit Corporation's investment therein as of the date of such transfer, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture."

INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

The International Wheat Agreement of 1962, originally signed by 25 importing and 10 exporting countries and to remain in force until July 1, 1965, encompasses all commercial trade in wheat and wheat flour between member countries. It established maximum and minimum prices at \$2.02½ and \$1.62½ a bushel, respectively, for the basic grade of wheat, Manitoba Northern at Fort William, Port Arthur, Canada, in terms of Canadian currency at the parity for the Canadian dollar determined for the purposes of the International Monetary Fund as at March 1, 1949. Importing countries undertake to purchase from participating exporting countries at prices within the prescribed price range, not less than a specified percentage of their total commercial imports.

Exporting countries undertake to make available to participating importing countries at prices within the price range, quantities of wheat sufficient to satisfy the commercial requirements of these countries.

Appropriation authority: Public Law 421 (7 U.S.C. 1641), October 27, 1949, as amended: "There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to make payments to the Commodity Credit Corporation of its estimated or actual net costs."

NATIONAL WOOL ACT

Under the National Wool Act, Commodity Credit Corporation is required to make incentive payments to eligible producers of wool and mohair on a percentage basis reflecting the amount required to bring the national average received by all producers up to the announced incentive level. The objective of this program is to encourage an annual domestic production of approximately 300 million pounds of shorn wool. The incentive level shall not exceed 110 percent of parity.

Appropriation authority: Public Law 690, title VII, National Wool Act (7 U.S.C. 1784), August 28, 1954:

"For the purpose of reimbursing the Commodity Credit Corporation for any expenditures made by it in connection with payments to producers under this title, there is hereby appropriated for each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, an amount equal to the total of expenditures made by the Corporation during the preceding fiscal year and to any amounts expended in prior fiscal years not previously reimbursed: *Provided, however,* That such amounts appropriated for any fiscal year

shall not exceed 70 per centum of the gross receipts from duties collected during the period January 1 to December 31, both inclusive, preceding the beginning of each such fiscal year on all articles subject to duty under schedule 11 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended."

Public Law 87-155, approved August 17, 1961, authorizes reimbursement to Commodity Credit Corporation for realized losses on price support and related programs. The new authority repealed sections 1 and 2 of the act of March 8, 1938, which provided for an appraisal by the Secretary of the Treasury of the assets and liabilities of the Corporation and authorized restoration of capital impairment or surplus payments to the Treasury based on such appraisal.

Appropriation authority: Public Law 87-155 (75 Stat. 391), August 17, 1961: "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually for each fiscal year, commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961 * * * an amount sufficient to reimburse Commodity Credit Corporation for its net realized loss incurred during such fiscal year, as reflected in the accounts and shown in its report of its financial condition as of the close of such fiscal year. Reimbursement of net realized loss shall be with appropriated funds * * * rather than through the cancellation of notes."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, so, today, we are simply dealing with a supplemental amount needed for the balance of this fiscal year to restore the capital structure and to enable the Commodity Credit Corporation to carry out all of its authorized program activities until June 30, 1963. Last year, the regular Agricultural Appropriation Act carried \$832 million less for reimbursement appropriations than was requested in the President's budget. The pending resolution restores \$508,172,000 of those reductions made for this year. All of these reimbursement appropriations will be dealt with again later in the session when the annual agricultural appropriation supply bill is under consideration in this body.

The Secretary of Agriculture testified before the committee that the borrowing authority of the Corporation was down to the perilously low level of \$127 million. As recently as early January, when the President's budget message was submitted to the Congress, it was the belief of the Secretary of Agriculture and of officials of the Commodity Credit Corporation that sufficient funds would be available to enable the Corporation to carry out its programs for the balance of fiscal 1963. As indicated in the committee report, unanticipated changes have recently occurred in use of the borrowing authority. There has been an unusually heavy demand for loans on 1962 crop corn, a decrease in the receipts from feed grain sales, a larger volume of cotton loans, continuing demands for dairy product purchases and export payments, together with the continuing expenses and costs of Public Law 480, as well as payments to producers for acreage diversion agreements pursuant to the Food and Agricultural Act of 1962.

In conclusion, Mr. President, the reimbursement appropriation for \$508,172,000 is entirely for expenses resulting from title I of Public Law 480 for sales of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies.

By advancing this amount from the 1964 budget request to the current fiscal year, the funds provided will enable the Commodity Credit Corporation to carry out all of its authorized programs for the balance of fiscal year 1963; that is, through June 30 of this year.

In fact, the need for this particular supplemental amount did not arise because of price support and related programs carried on by the Commodity Credit Corporation under price support and related programs, but is due to the costs under Public Law 480. I want to make it amply clear that the deficiency in borrowing authority available to the Commodity Credit Corporation at this time does not arise from the feed grain program, the wheat program, or any other of its regular authorized program activities, but is occasioned by the expenses incident to carrying out Public Law 480.

That, Mr. President, is, of course, a foreign aid activity, rather than a strictly domestic agricultural activity.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate approve the pending resolution (H.J. Res. 284) as reported from the committee, without amendment.

I wish to call attention just briefly to the fact that the pending joint resolution, of course, has already been passed by the other body, and is here now for final consideration. If approved without amendment it would, as the Secretary believes and states, allow the Department of Agriculture to operate without further requests for supplemental funds to the conclusion of the present fiscal year, or until June 30, 1963.

I now yield to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, the ranking minority member of the subcommittee.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I support the joint resolution which is now before the Senate. This is a policy which we have followed for years, right or wrong, that of obligating the Federal Government under certain contracts, and to reimburse it afterward. This bill happens to provide for the reimbursement of expenditures under Public Law 480. It concerns the selling of our surplus food to hungry people throughout the world for their currencies. Much of these currencies are then used locally to help those people. In fact, it is really a foreign aid program that we have here. The State Department has testified year after year that if it were not for this program they would have to ask for additional funds under their foreign aid program for exactly their kind of assistance.

I know of no program that has gained more friends for the United States than giving them our surplus food or selling it to them for their currency. On page 24 of the hearings is a table showing the amount of those funds from July 1, 1954, through December 31, 1962, and their use. The total of these funds amounted to \$9,068,660,000, 7.1 percent was used for the common defense of the two countries, 18.3 percent was used for grants for economic development, 5.9 percent was used for loans to private enterprise, 45.7 percent was used for loans to these foreign governments, 23 percent was

used for U.S. uses, such as the expenses of embassies and other uses we might have for these currencies.

If this money were not repaid to the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Department of Agriculture would be in the position of having to foot the whole bill for one of our best foreign aid programs. I do not think we want to have those expenditures permanently charged to the farm program.

Uses of foreign currency as provided in title I, Public Law 480 agreements signed July 1, 1954, to Dec. 31, 1962¹

[Amounts are in thousand dollar equivalents at the deposit rate of exchange]

Country	Total amount in agreements (market value including overseas transportation)	104(c) Common defense	104(e) Grants for economic development	104(e) Loans to private enterprise	104(g) Loans to foreign governments	For U.S. uses ²
Argentina.....	64,100			8,250	36,500	19,350
Austria.....	42,940				26,328	16,612
Bolivia.....	24,559			3,132	17,375	4,052
Brazil.....	386,420	2,000	34,400		285,247	64,773
Burma.....	51,370		8,134		32,525	10,711
Ceylon.....	30,800		5,280	5,465	12,720	7,335
Chile.....	71,900	100		850	56,330	14,620
China (Taiwan).....	163,110	85,981		15,800	26,840	34,489
Colombia.....	70,890	80		11,270	41,180	18,360
Congo.....	18,750		16,875			1,875
Ecuador.....	13,190			1,273	8,785	3,132
Finland.....	46,535			3,615	25,634	17,286
France.....	35,775			7,824		27,951
Germany.....	1,200					1,200
Greece.....	109,300	5,040	7,470	9,171	53,450	34,169
Guinea.....	10,670			298	7,811	2,561
Iceland.....	13,930		198	567	10,119	3,046
India.....	2,428,306		788,175	165,262	1,164,933	309,936
Indonesia.....	314,025		25,312	21,086	213,497	54,130
Iran.....	60,971	5,763		3,253	27,803	14,152
Israel.....	291,069		32,589	46,891	172,899	38,690
Italy.....	152,900			6,250	100,500	46,150
Japan.....	150,800	700	600		108,850	40,650
Korea.....	342,860	290,583		5,891		46,386
Mexico.....	28,200			7,100	13,600	7,500
Morocco.....	21,870			2,130	14,273	5,467
Netherlands.....	275					275
Pakistan.....	1,065,920	79,366	556,841	51,740	276,432	101,541
Paraguay.....	13,200		3,420	1,170	6,000	2,610
Peru.....	37,280	100		3,762	22,723	10,695
Philippines.....	36,150	8,102	3,045	6,438	8,027	10,538
Poland.....	425,700					425,700
Portugal.....	7,100				3,400	3,700
Spain.....	505,630	9,910			253,480	242,240
Sudan.....	4,600		1,150	690	1,610	1,150
Syrian Arab Republic.....	37,200			6,550	22,750	7,900
Thailand.....	4,600				2,050	2,550
Tunisia.....	33,600		7,700	4,020	16,665	5,215
Turkey.....	386,065	97,750	2,340	42,011	115,000	128,964
United Arab Republic.....	782,940		25,731	77,604	554,047	125,658
United Kingdom.....	48,150					48,150
Uruguay.....	48,400			12,050	24,300	12,050
Vietnam.....	71,280	54,930		5,725		10,625
Yugoslavia.....	624,130		143,092		378,333	102,705
Total.....	9,068,660	640,405	1,662,352	537,038	4,142,016	2,086,849
Uses as percent of total.....	100.0	7.1	18.3	5.9	45.7	23.0

¹ Many agreements provide for the various currency uses in terms of percentages of the amounts of local currency accruing pursuant to sales made under each agreement. In such cases, amounts included in this table for each use are determined by applying the specified percentages to the total dollar amount provided in each agreement. Amounts shown are subject to adjustment when actual commodity purchases and currency allocations have been made.

² Fiscal year 1962 agreements provide that a specific amount of foreign currency proceeds may be used under various U.S. use categories, including currency uses which are limited to amounts as may be specified in appropriation acts. Included are uses specified under subsections 104 (a), (b), (f), (h), (i), (j), (k), (l), (m), (n), (o), (p), (q), (r), (s) and sometimes (c) and (d), insofar as specified in agreements.

³ Amounts shown in this column may differ from amounts on table 3, which reflect purchase authorization transactions.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the 23 percent which is applied for U.S. uses is for such items as the building of embassies and legations, the buying of food for our personnel, military or otherwise, in the areas where the local currencies are available, and other similar purposes which are strictly U.S. expenditures for our own benefit.

The fact is that none of these currencies for use in these countries can be used to support or carry on the normal, ordinary functions of the Commodity

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the very clear statement made by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire table be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

policy—for them to come to us on a single reimbursement item, a matter as to which there cannot be any doubt about our duty to the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Corporation has simply carried out the foreign policy assistance program created by Congress and approved by the President, and has asked for this restoration of funds. When restored, this amount will enable the Commodity Credit Corporation, in its present judgment, to complete its full operations for the current fiscal year.

The other reimbursement appropriation items, which are of a similar nature, have to do with domestic operations, and will come before the committee for hearing in connection with the regular supply bill for the Department of Agriculture. At that time the wisdom or unwisdom of all of them may be gone into before the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses, and, of course, the wisdom or unwisdom of these programs may be gone into before the legislative committees which handle agricultural matters in the Senate and in the other body. But this joint resolution does not relate to such items.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this is an obligation which must obviously be discharged. It relates to operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation which are authorized by law. It is intended to replace money which was expended in earlier days and will repair the capital stock of the Corporation which has been impaired.

But this matter goes infinitely further, notwithstanding the fact that this item is an obligation and, as such, there is nothing offensive about it. I take this opportunity to say that as other appropriation bills, notably the regular supply bills, come before the Senate, there will be amendments and suggestions for reductions and adjustments. I think I ought to say that a request will be made for yea-and-nay votes on those proposals and upon the passage of those bills.

In the last few years we have done very little about having yea-and-nay votes on appropriation bills; but in view of the approaching tax bill and the importance of the reduction of expenditures as a hedge and an offset, I believe that a record must be made, and it should be so written and so made that all the world can see.

I thought I ought to interpose that thought at this particular time, because this is the first deficiency or supplemental supply measure to be considered at this session. In due course, the whole entourage of appropriation bills will come before the Senate, and we shall have some very specific recommendations to make at that time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement made by the distinguished minority leader, and it is a constructive statement. He has correctly stated the exact meaning and substance of this particular measure.

Credit Corporation, for its domestic operations intended to help agriculture in this Nation.

I think the case is clearly made by the committee report and also by the hearing record. But rather than to delve at this time into the numerous phases on which hearings will be held later on various items on which there have been losses, or where there will be need for repairment of capital, the Department of Agriculture has, instead, preferred—and for myself, I completely agree with that

I shall welcome his approach to the later items which he mentions, because the Congress should be very careful in passing upon all of the items of expenditures of public funds, including those which are involved in the important activities of the Department of Agriculture.

However, I call the Senator's attention to the fact that we may be faced with situations in which the Department will simply be carrying out the purposes of the legislation which Congress has passed. In that case, although I have frequently been against such legislation, I would have to vote for the approval of items properly created under legislation which Congress has passed. In other words, when we are passing upon legislation, we are in one position; but after the legislation has been enacted and the money spent under it, we may be in an entirely different situation, as the Senator from Illinois well knows.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I recognize that whenever there is an obligation—and sometimes a moral obligation is involved—there is a duty to discharge it. But this situation affords an opportunity, also, to call attention to the fact that the new budget contains many items which call for completely new obligatory authority, new functions, and new projects of one kind or another. I think we shall have one of them later in the week in connection with a recreation project. As I see it, these proposals envision the creation of bureaus for numerous purposes; and everyone knows how bureaus proliferate.

I remember when we first took \$5 million out of the contingent fund to establish the Peace Corps. Now the Peace Corps, in the 1964 budget, calls for \$108 million. It will be rather interesting to see what amount will be sought for the Peace Corps for fiscal 1965.

Also, I have read that there is an office downtown which is taking applications for the domestic Peace Corps. It has started probably with minor borrowing from the contingent fund; but in due course it will be before Congress; and then, like Topsy, it will grow, and who shall say the dimensions it will take before we get through?

There are quite a number of such proposals, which, of course, we shall have to examine with a rather hard, perspective eye.

Mr. AIKEN and Mr. LAUSCHE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EDMONDSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I had agreed to yield next to the distinguished Senator from Vermont, who is the ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; following which I shall gladly yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I believe Public Law 480 has been one of the most potent weapons that the United States has used in the cold war, which has been taking place during recent years. I, too, think the amount requested to supplement the amount available to the Com-

modity Credit Corporation is necessary. It is an obligation of Congress to provide that amount. However, I think we ought to make the record as clear as possible. I notice that the Secretary of Agriculture, in his communication to Members of Congress under date of February 28, states:

CCC holdings of wheat and feed grains were 1,077,000 bushels less on February 15, 1963, than the peak quantities held in 1961, before the new program was effective.

That statement appears on the second page of the Secretary's communication.

The question I ask is, at what period of the year are peak quantities of feed grains held by the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. HOLLAND. I would have to say to the distinguished Senator from Vermont that I would have to get the information elsewhere before I could answer his question fully. I am prepared to deal with any of the items which have to do with the operation of Public Law 480 in connection with this matter, but not in connection with matters which will come up in the general hearing on the agricultural supply bill. I understand that the date on which the Secretary based his statement was February 15, 1963.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not have before me the date of the beginning of the period to which his statement related—if that is what is sought by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I think that is what we should look into, because it is my impression that feed grains are taken over beginning in August and wheat a little earlier; and, naturally, if those holdings were obtained at about that time in 1961, it seems to me it would be more appropriate for the Secretary of Agriculture to compare the holdings of February 15, 1963, with those of February 15, 1962. Perhaps he did. I wish to make clear that he did not compare one period of 1963, reflecting the takeover from the 1961 crop, with the corresponding period of 1962 which would reflect the takeover from the 1960 crop. His failure to do so could make a difference of several hundred million bushels.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think the point is a fair one. I call the attention of the distinguished Senator to the fact that, as an ex-officio member of the Appropriations Committee, he will of course be present at the hearings on the Department of Agriculture supply bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I suggest that at that time he clarify this question—not that I am unwilling to do so, but merely because I do not have the information as to the date of the beginning of the period to which the statement by the Secretary of Agriculture relates.

I fully agree with the Senator from Vermont that the same date and inventory facts for the various years should be used, in order to make a real comparison.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

In addition, I notice that apparently the Secretary takes credit for a reduction of a billion bushels in the supply of

feed grains and wheat for the programs which have been in effect during the last 2 years. Does not the Senator from Florida understand that there has been a very large increase in the utilization of feed and in the exports of wheat during the last 2 years?

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course that is correct. The authorized operations under Public Law 480, for example, have been increased very greatly; and it was the duty of the Secretary to increase them, because the law we passed directed him to do so.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. So in arriving at the exact meaning of his statement, much more than is available as of now is involved.

Mr. AIKEN. I do have the information that during the last 2 years the exports of feed grains increased 268 million bushels over the level of the previous year—the figures for which the Secretary uses for comparison; and the utilization of feed grains for livestock feeding increased 300 million bushels—making a total of 568 million bushels of this reduction which was due entirely to increased exports and increased feeding in this country. Those figures do not take wheat into consideration. I note that the Secretary compares the amount of wheat on hand now with the amount on hand at the peak period in 1961. It is my recollection that the wheat program has been in effect only 1 year. Therefore, any reduction which took place between 1961 and 1962 should not be credited to a program which was not in existence at that time.

I raise these points merely because I cannot avoid feeling that the Department of Agriculture has grossly exaggerated the benefits of these two programs; and I feel that this point should be made clear for the record.

Mr. HOLLAND. I agree with the distinguished Senator to this extent: I feel that the record should be made completely clear before we get through with this year's activities. I do not think it has much relationship to the presently pending bill; and I recall to the mind of the distinguished Senator that the two programs he has mentioned are not programs which I supported, and differences of opinion as to the wisdom of those programs are to be found on each side of the aisle.

What the Senator seeks—and I think he is entitled to the information, and I shall help in every way I can to obtain it—is a complete explanation of our present situation and a completely factual comparison or contrast, as the case may be, between the present situation and the situation at the appropriate times in the past which the Senator from Vermont has in mind.

Mr. AIKEN. I am sure that when the main legislation comes up for renewal, the Senator from Florida and I will be found to be not very far apart. Perhaps I am a little unduly critical of some of these communications from the Department of Agriculture; but this cynicism, or whatever one may wish to call it, was prompted by recent releases relative to the dairy program—releases in

which, in an apparent attempt to make it appear that conditions got worse after Congress rejected the administration's request for compulsory dairy controls, they showed that purchases of dairy products in 1962 were greater than those in 1961. However, they were completely oblivious, or apparently they were oblivious, to the fact that in 1961 there were 3 months—January, February, and March—in which there were no accumulations whatever of butter and cheese in this country. Therefore, in that case they compared the purchases of butter and cheese for 12 months in 1 year with the purchases of those commodities during 9 months in the previous year.

I refer to these several instances and I make these statements in the hope that there may be some reformation by the Department of Agriculture, with the result that the reports and the releases will be issued in such a way that the average reader can obtain the correct picture by referring to page 1, rather than have to be expert enough to refer also to pages 16, 33, and other pages and study complicated tables, and thus figure out the truth, if he can. The truth is usually there, but it is not always readily discernible.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if I have noted anything in the course of watching the operations of both the present Secretary of Agriculture and his predecessor and earlier predecessors, I have never found any of them unwilling to provide the facts. I have never found a time when Senators and Members of the House of Representatives were not able to digest those facts and arrive at the correct conclusions, and I have never found a time when the Secretary of Agriculture was not able to defend himself when asked questions—sometimes questions by the distinguished Senator from Vermont, sometimes questions by other Senators on his side of the aisle, and sometimes questions by Senators on this side of the aisle.

We are dealing with an immense program which cannot be reviewed today here with any real justice to any part of the program.

So I think this matter should properly be reserved for later discussion, because it seems to me that the fact is—as has been well stated by the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]—that this particular item is unquestionably a just one on which we must proceed to repair the capital structure; and I hope we proceed speedily to do so.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I agreed to yield first to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE]. After yielding to him, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Delaware.

I yield now to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, following the statement of the Senator from Vermont, I should like to add that when I served on the bench, my mental process was as follows: The witness would appear before the court. As the judge of the court, I swore in the witness. I did

not relegate that duty to my clerk. The oath was as follows:

You do solemnly swear that you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

I felt that for the purpose of streamlining it would be enough to say, "You do solemnly swear to tell the truth," and leave out the words, "the whole truth and nothing but the truth." Upon analysis it became clear to me that the words "the whole truth" had significance. What one tells may be true, but because of what is omitted, what is told may become untrue.

I frequently find omissions which clearly indicate that what has been told is true, but the failure to tell the whole truth labeled as untrue that which was told.

I should like to obtain some information for purposes of clarification. Perhaps the Senator from Florida is not able to give me the information I desire. What I am saying also has a relationship to the thoughts raised by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. With regard to the expenditures of the Commodity Credit Corporation, I have figures showing that in 1962 reimbursement for net realized losses was \$1,017,610,000, with reimbursement for a special milk program of \$90 million, making a total of \$1,107,610,000.

The amazing point is that the program will jump in 1963 to \$2,373 million. The losses are \$1,200 million more in 1963 than they were in 1962. Can the Senator from Florida explain why the losses have increased by that amount? Is it because more of the Commodity Credit Corporation's products have been sold at a loss?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Ohio, in complete good faith, is bringing into his question the item of reimbursement for net realized losses in various years of the Commodity Credit Corporation, growing out of all its regular operations. I invite his attention to the fact that the losses have varied. They have risen and fallen in various years.

I have before me a tabulation beginning in 1955 and coming through 1963, which means that the price support programs and other programs of the CCC, like everything else in agriculture, have fluctuated with weather conditions, crop conditions, and crop volume, with all the various things that happen to make agriculture always a speculative and not a certain operation.

The Senator will note that the appropriations to meet these losses have gone all the way from only \$1,634,659 in 1956 to a total of \$2,110,424,413 for 1960 and other varying amounts. So there is no real basis for expecting uniformity year after year in an agriculture program because it does not operate in that way.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Am I correct in my understanding that with the present activities, programs relating to surplus foods are resulting in a greater cost to the taxpayer than has been the case for several years past?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. That results primarily from the fact that the scope of the Public Law 480 program was very largely stepped up through the farm legislation enacted 2 years ago. We passed such legislation because we had found that the operation under Public Law 480 was very helpful in the foreign policy of our Nation. It was the joint judgment of the two Houses of Congress, by great majorities, that the best way to serve ourselves in the field of mutual assistance or foreign aid was to step up this particular aspect of the program. The distinguished Senator from Vermont has already touched on that subject—and I fully agree with him—by stating that the food program to which we refer has been found to be the most helpful part of the whole mutual assistance program.

I well remember—and I am sure the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] will remember also, because, as I recall, they served on the same conference committee on which the Senator from Florida served when Public Law 480 was set up—that there was a bipartisan approach.

For example, I remember that one of the distinguished authors of that program was our friend the late distinguished Senator from Kansas, Mr. Schoeppel.

Others came from the Democratic side of the aisle. There has always been a bipartisan effort to do something which would get rid of our surpluses, but get rid of them to excellent advantage in the building of more results for our country out of foreign aid and mutual assistance programs. The results have been better than any other part of the foreign aid program.

In 1961 we greatly enlarged the program. For that reason we are now beginning to see a largely increased reimbursement appropriation made each year to the Commodity Credit Corporation as required under an amendment which enlarged the authorization 2 years ago.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I think the major reason for the increase of the funds in the agriculture bill is that in years gone by sizable sums were appropriated in the foreign aid program for food to go to foreign countries. Now practically all of that program is carried in the agriculture bill. Not much of it is now included in the foreign aid appropriations bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. When did we insert the granting of food aid under Public Law 480 and take it out of the foreign aid bill? For my information, was that done recently?

Mr. HOLLAND. My recollection is that it was done in 1954.

My recollection is that the requirement that the sum be included in an appropriation bill rather than handled through the cancellation of notes was accomplished under a very worthwhile

amendment offered, as I recall—and if I am in error the Senator can now correct me—by the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. Before the adoption of the amendment these operations were handled on a paper basis. The CCC made notes to the Treasury. Of course, they were audited. Then the notes were canceled.

As I recall, under the amendment, offered by the Senator from Delaware it was required that for the information of the Congress and the people an actual appropriation be made so that annually, at least, the size of our operations in terms of costs to the United States in cash might be understood. Personally, I believe it was an excellent thing to do. As I recall, that amendment was later than 1954. Perhaps it was in 1957 or 1958 that that amendment was offered. Will the Senator from Delaware refresh my mind on that point?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not recall the exact year, but the Senator is correct. I was the author of an amendment which would require annual appropriations to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation. As the Senator has stated, it was done for the purpose of enabling Congress and the taxpayers to know the cost of the program.

Mr. HOLLAND. I correct the RECORD to say that that amendment was adopted in the act of March 20, 1954; which means it has been in operation now for 9 years.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I recognize this is a fixed obligation we must honor. My query to the Senator from Florida relates to whether or not the discretionary action by the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, in March of 1961, in lifting the price support on cotton from \$3.24 to \$3.42, contributed to the deficit.

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe the Senator is referring to the dairy prices.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct; to the dairy prices.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think that lift did play some part in the creation of a greater deficit for CCC in its regular price support operations. That had no relation to the presently pending measure or the fund which is to be covered thereby.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The raising of the support from \$3.24 to \$3.42 was made under the provision of law which gives the Secretary authority to raise the support "whenever the Secretary determines" that is necessary to insure an adequate supply of dairy products; is that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. The law has always simply laid down guidelines, but left to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture the cash amount to be fixed as the basis of support year after year in the various commodities. That is the only practical way in which it can be done.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Our problem with respect to a dairy surplus has been aggravated; am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is probably correct in that understanding.

I say to the Senator that there is no action which the Secretary can take—in raising, or sustaining, or lowering price support levels—which is not reflected in the total operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation. That is a fact which I am sure the Congress recognized when it passed the original price support act and which it has recognized every time amendments or new acts have been passed. Certainly every decision based on the discretion of the Secretary in this very complex field does tend to affect in some way or other the operations of the CCC.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the present status of the cotton storage in the Commodity Credit Corporation? It has gone up rather extensively, has it not?

Mr. HOLLAND. It has gone up. The situation with reference to cotton is so disturbing that I understand the Secretary has made specific recommendations for legislation in that field. I also understand that those specific recommendations have not been received with uniform acclaim either in this body or in the other body. It is a highly complex and highly controversial subject, which I hope we shall not have to go into now, because it does not have direct relation to the subject matter of the pending measure.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In 1961 the Secretary increased by 2 cents a pound the support on cotton, bringing it up to 32 cents. It is my understanding that that was done because it was thought there was not an adequate supply of cotton.

Did that discretionary judgment aggravate the problem we have with respect to surpluses of cotton?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, Senators are not agreed on an answer. Neither are Members of the other body. Some think it aggravated the problem. Some think it was a justified action.

I say again to my friend, I am not anxious to ignore the problem. I certainly expect it to be presented to us in a very detailed way when there are appropriate hearings. Probably we shall be confronted with it both in the legislative committee and in the Committee on Appropriations.

But again I say, with all kindness, I do not think this is the time or the place to deal with that.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I merely asked the questions because I cannot help but feel

alarmed about the cost of this program and the recurrence of aggravated expense when assurances have been given that the costs would be lowered.

I will go along with the Senator from Florida on this measure, but I agree with what the Senator from Illinois said—that we had better take a good look at the program this year.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I agree heartily with the distinguished Senator from Illinois. I expect to have to take two good looks at it—one in the Appropriations Committee, in which the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] and I, though we happen to be on the two different sides of the aisle, nearly always are together on the question of supplying the needs of agriculture; and the other in the legislative committee, since the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] and I happen to be members of the Senate committee which deals with legislative problems affecting agriculture.

I surely expect that the cotton matter mentioned by the distinguished Senator, and many others, will be reviewed in both those committees before we conclude the present session of Congress.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, earlier this afternoon the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] raised a question as to the dates used by the Secretary of Agriculture in comparing inventory holdings of wheat, corn, and certain other commodities.

I have figures which will show the inventories for January 1 for each of the past 3 years. In order that we may have a comparison of these inventories on comparable dates, I ask unanimous consent that the figures showing inventories of wheat, corn, and other feed grains, as well as dairy products, for January 1, 1961, 1962, and 1963, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

While these figures show inventories of both corn and wheat down in the past 2 years, they also show that the inventories of sorghum grains, butter, butter oil, cheese, and dried milk, to be substantially higher than they were when Secretary Freeman took office.

There being no objection, the information was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Commodity Credit Corporation inventories

Date	Corn (bushels)	Wheat (bushels)	Grain sorghum (bushels)	Butter (pounds)	Dried milk (pounds)	Cheese (pounds)	Butter oil (pounds)
Jan. 1, 1961.....	1,471,276,965	1,132,960,901	311,965,117	66,295,284	279,836,322		
Jan. 1, 1962.....	1,412,192,934	1,130,279,687	341,404,047	205,679,438	354,917,176	59,709,137	
Jan. 1, 1963.....	1,044,325,049	1,044,992,557	579,266,082	350,791,457	662,458,995	111,587,560	48,339,956

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I may say that I am glad to have those figures printed in the RECORD, and I would be glad to have printed any other figures which bear upon any problem Senators wish to have reflected in the debate. I hope, however, we will all remember that we are now dealing simply with an obligation we ourselves set up by the leg-

islation which we passed, and we should now recognize that by passing the pending measure.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I appreciate that point. I think it would be well to have figures for these inventories on comparable dates, rather than to have the Department compare a low point with a high point.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think it will be helpful to have those figures in the RECORD.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Since I asked the question originally as to the peak holdings of feed grains by the Commodity Credit Corporation in 1961, I am advised that the date was October 1; which is the beginning of the feeding season and the beginning of the 1962 corn marketing year, also.

At that time—October 1, 1961—the Commodity Credit Corporation held 2,169,753,000 bushels of the four feed grains. On February 15, 1963, the Commodity Credit Corporation owned 1,374,517,000 bushels of feed grain, or 795,236,000 bushels less than held at the high point in 1961.

The Department records show that the increase in feeding and exports for the past 2 years amounted to 568 million bushels. If we deduct that from the 795,236,000 bushels, as a result of the program, it shows that the net reduction in holdings would be 227,236,000 bushels, which is quite a bit different from 1.1 billion bushels.

He undoubtedly had some answers for this, because they have some good pencils there. If they did not, they would not get everybody so confused as to what the actual figures are. But this is the pencil I used and I got this result. Really, for the \$1½ billion spent on the feed grain programs—and I do not know what it was on the wheat program—we reduced the supply by 796 million bushels, which means it cost about \$1.90 a bushel to reduce the supply to that extent.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad the Senator has mentioned these figures for the RECORD. It points out the fact that there is a complicated study in accounting and fixing of blame ahead of us, but it does not have to get into this consideration today.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield.

Mr. COOPER. Like many others in this body, I had the opportunity to vote for Public Law 480 when it was originally passed in 1954. As the distinguished Senator from Florida has said, it has enjoyed bipartisan support throughout the years. I believe it is one of the best programs of foreign aid that the United States uses. It is the best program for many countries and their people because it supplies their needs of food and fiber. Also, as the Senator again said, it is a program which only the United States can follow. It is one that the Communist countries cannot use except perhaps in a very, very small way. Yet, as the Senator from Florida has suggested, there is a certain contradiction—I am not sure whether he suggested this—between the agricultural program and Public Law 480 program, which is actually basically a foreign-aid program. On the one hand, the Department of Agriculture attempts to reduce surpluses. On the other, it helps subsidies in carrying out Public Law 480.

I see in the chair a distinguished Senator [Mr. McGOVERN] who was director of the program until he resigned to become a candidate. I am sure that the additional volumes of surplus food which were disposed of in the last 2 years were the result, to a large extent, of his efforts.

I should like to ask the Senator from Florida about this problem: He mentioned in his statement a few moments ago the cost of this program, which is over \$1 billion a year. I believe many persons in this country, and certainly a great many of those who write on surplus problems, while they may know, do not at times make it clear that the \$1½ billion which in the last year has been obligated is a chief part of the foreign-aid program. Would the Senator from Florida think it would be possible? As the Secretary of Agriculture each year presented his programs to the Congress, and, as the Senator so well knows he does, estimated the disappearance or use of feed grains, wheat, and other commodities—if we are going to have the Public Law 480 program, and I think we should—would it not be possible for him to place as one of the factors in his estimation of the disappearance of surpluses “x hundred million dollars, Public Law 480, which is an essential part of the foreign-aid program”? If that were done, I think there would be a clearer understanding in this country about the work of the Public Law 480 program and also about the cost of the agricultural program.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think the Senator has raised a good point. Two years ago our committee report stated it would be appropriate to show these food disappearances under foreign aid. The Secretary of Agriculture, while he showed all the facts from which one could figure it out for himself, is willing to show it in one figure and as foreign aid, but the President's budget advisers are not in agreement upon that. As I have been advised in the course of the hearings, there is disagreement between the two branches of the executive department as to the method of accounting for it as we wished and expressed the hope it would be, and which would have the furnishing of the information to the committee as the Senator from Kentucky pointed out.

I thoroughly agree with him. The public ought to know, year after year, just what our surpluses are and just what funds have been expended in foreign aid. I think we can make it clearer to the public and also relieve agriculture immediately from the burden of being charged with having that additional amount added to the total cost of the agricultural program.

I may say that no one has been more insistent than the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, throughout the years, that this policy be followed. Frankly, I am at a loss to know why the Bureau of the Budget is not willing to follow his request.

Mr. COOPER. I believe we ought to insist on it, because this is the only way accurately to describe the cost of the farm program, and also the cost of the Public Law 480 program as a part of foreign aid.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I share the opinion of the Senator from Kentucky. For years I have been trying to get action like that now proposed, under the Eisenhower administration and since then, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations. We have an agricultural budget of about \$7 billion, and all these items are listed as expenditures. Most people believe that the farmers get a subsidy check for it. There are involved nearly \$600 million in loans for various agencies, which have a very good repayment record, and nearly \$300 million of loans to the FHA, which also has a very good repayment record.

The school lunch program and several other programs are charged as expenditures of the Department of Agriculture. It is the feeling of many people that the farmers get a subsidy check for this. All this is a good example of parts of the foreign aid program which are charged to agriculture. Many people believe that it is charged as a subsidy to the farmers. I hope we can get this changed.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have strongly supported the insistent attitude of the Senator from North Dakota year after year, and that attitude is shared by the Senator from Kentucky. We should keep working for a change. I do not want it to appear that the essential facts are not supplied, because they are. I mean that in order to get at what is actually charged to agriculture and what is charged to foreign aid, one must take a pencil and figure here and there, not only in the Public Law 480 program, but in the international wheat program as well, and in various other places, in order to come up with the answer.

I have insisted year after year that we are entitled to have a plain, understandable answer on this matter so that we can reflect the actual size of the agricultural program, and what it is. It is big enough, but it is not as big as some people insist it is, particularly people who are critical because of misapprehension as to what the real size of it may be.

Mr. HUMPHREY rose.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I wish to join the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from North Dakota for their insistence that the analysis of the Department of Agriculture's budget be not only factual in terms of statistics, but also in terms of objectives and purposes for which these funds are committed. During my service on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I was as insistent about this matter as is the Senator from North Dakota. I consider the presentation of the Department of Agriculture's budget incomplete, inadequate, and, in a sense, inaccurate, when it comes to the proper interpretation of the use of the moneys which are provided to the Department of Agriculture.

Let us take, for example, the food stamp plan. While this is a program which was worked out within the Department of Agriculture and the Committees on Agriculture and Forestry of the two Houses of Congress, and falls

within the jurisdiction of the Committees on Agriculture and Forestry, the food stamp plan is a relief program; it is an assistance program. It ought to be assigned by some notation within the Bureau of the Budget to a category called public assistance.

This undoubtedly would fall within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. If the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare does not wish to have this amount fixed in its budget, at least there ought to be a footnote or there ought to be a cross-reference in the budget as it comes from the President which notes that the food stamp program, the school milk program, the school lunch program, the assistance program for the needy through the use of surplus foods, and so forth, are items which belong to public welfare and public assistance.

The meat inspection program, for example, relates to health. The poultry inspection program relates to health. The international wheat program relates to foreign policy. I believe it is fair to point out that the export subsidy program relates to trade and foreign policy. The amounts can be tabulated under the Department of Agriculture, but there ought to be a cross-reference in the budget, as I have indicated.

If the executive branch of the Government is unwilling to do it, I believe we ought to adopt a resolution in Congress demanding that it be done. If we cannot get some help voluntarily from the Bureau of the Budget on this matter, then I believe we ought to direct that there be a clarification. The Department of Agriculture's budget today is not a reflection of the Department of Agriculture's programs insofar as price-support programs or marketing programs are concerned, relating to the farmer and his production and distribution problems.

I wish to join most vociferously and vigorously with the efforts which have been made today to have the budget show the facts. The facts are clear. What the facts relate to is another thing. The fact of the matter is that Public Law 480 is probably the most effective foreign economic aid program that we have. That program ought to be noted as a part of foreign assistance. It ought to be shown as a valuable part of our foreign aid and as a part of our foreign policy.

I call attention to the fact that the present Presiding Officer—Mr. McGovern in the chair—was the Director of the food-for-peace program in the new administration which came into office in 1961, and I submit that it is to the credit of the farmers of America, the Department of Agriculture, and the food-for-peace office, and to the credit of the producers on the farm, that we have Public Law 480 on the statute books.

We ought to look at it not as something that aids the farmers, but as something that helps people. The fact of the matter is that the farmers are but the producers of the food. We do not call the defense program aid for American industry, even though the defense program procurement is produced by some of our great industries. We call it de-

fense, and properly so. We ought to call Public Law 480 a part of our foreign economic assistance program and a part of our international good will program. It ought to be tabulated in the budget to show what it is.

When the people in the Bureau of the Budget read the RECORD they will note there are Senators who have served here for many years who believe that the time is long overdue for the kind of clarification of the budget procedures which we have talked about here this afternoon. If we do not get it I will submit a resolution, and call upon my colleagues to back that resolution, ordering the Bureau of the Budget to print its report accurately in terms of what these figures represent.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota. I wish to call attention to the fact that the Senator from Minnesota has just pointed up a few of the complexities which exist in this whole bookkeeping process. We have been talking in this resolution simply about the operations under title I, under Public Law 480. We also have the famine relief operation under another title, and we also have the barter for strategic materials program under another act, which is completely apart from Public Law 480. There is institutional supply program, which does not come under public welfare.

This is a very complex bookkeeping operation. However, what is necessary can be done. I fully agree with the distinguished Senator that it should be done. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I desire to commend the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota and the senior Senator from North Dakota and the senior Senator from Florida for clarifying the budget situation with reference to the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture.

I remember when the Senator from Minnesota served on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. He, along with the senior Senator from North Dakota and other Senators, pointed out that the vast segment of the so-called appropriations for the Department of Agriculture related to agriculture only in a very minor way, if in any degree whatever.

A few days ago, I requested the Department of Agriculture to break down the budget in this regard, because I have been interested in trying to devise and promote a farm program which would subsidize only farmers, instead of subsidizing railroads, subsidizing warehouses, subsidizing foreigners, and subsidizing every aspect of the American economy, all in the name of aiding farmers to improve their income.

I was indeed surprised when the Department of Agriculture submitted to me a breakdown of its proposed budget for the fiscal year 1964. The Department will request approximately \$6,500 million. A study and analysis of that budget will show that only about \$2 billion relates to agriculture and support prices. Even including the Rural Elec-

trification Administration, which is a rural program, but not exclusively a farm program, the appropriation for agriculture still amounts to only about \$3 billion, out of \$6,500 million which is requested under the guise of a farm program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a breakdown and analysis of that budget.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. Department of Agriculture, budget expenditures, fiscal year 1964, estimated

PROGRAMS WHICH CLEARLY PROVIDE BENEFITS TO CONSUMERS, BUSINESSMEN, AND THE GENERAL PUBLIC

	Millions
Programs having foreign relations and defense aspects:	
Sales of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies...	\$1,282
Emergency famine relief to friendly peoples.....	246
International Wheat Agreement.....	72
Transfer of bartered materials to supplemental stockpile.....	62
Payments to Veterans' Administration and armed services under section 202 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, for milk and other dairy products used in excess of normal requirements....	40
Value of foreign currencies used by Defense Department for military housing, and long-term supply contracts.....	284
Defense food stockpiling.....	30
Total.....	2,016
Food distribution programs:	
Commodity purchases under the program for removal of surplus agricultural commodities.....	164
Pilot food stamp plan.....	51
School lunch program.....	182
Special milk program.....	102
Total.....	499
Investment in REA and FHA loans, which are subject to repayment:	
REA loans.....	259
FHA loans.....	189
Total.....	448
Long-range programs for the improvement of agricultural resources, including research, meat inspection, disease and pest control, education, market development and services, protection of soil and water resources, and forest and public land management:	
Forest Service.....	311
Agricultural Research Service.....	195
Soil Conservation Service.....	195
Extension Service.....	77
Cooperative State Experiment Station Service.....	40
Agricultural Marketing Service, Marketing Research & Service....	43
Farmers Home Administration, salaries and expenses.....	39
Other, including FCS, FAS, CEA, FCIC, REA expenses, and staff offices.....	94
Total.....	994
Total.....	3,957

U.S. Department of Agriculture, budget expenditures, fiscal year 1964, estimated—Continued

OTHER PROGRAMS WHICH ARE PREDOMINANTLY FOR STABILIZATION OF FARM INCOME, BUT WHICH ALSO BENEFIT OTHERS

	Millions
Agricultural conservation program.....	\$124
Conservation reserve program.....	294
Land-use adjustment program.....	27
CCC price support, supply, and related programs:	
CCC price support, supply and related programs.....	327
Less: Payments to Veterans' Administration and armed services under section 202 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, for milk and other dairy products used in excess of normal requirements.....	-40
Acreage diversion payments:	
Feed grains.....	227
Wheat.....	173
Price support payments:	
Feed grains.....	490
Wheat.....	91
National Wool Act program.....	106
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service expenses.....	115
Total.....	1,989
Sugar Act program.....	84
Total.....	2,608
Grand total.....	6,565

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I agree wholeheartedly with the view of the able Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the able Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the able Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] that it is high time that we not saddle every so-called expenditure on the face of the earth on the poor farmer's back and say it is a farmer's program, when it relates to health, public welfare, foreign aid, and every other aspect of the Federal Government, yet is submitted to Congress under the guise of a so-called farm bill.

Many of those programs are fine. I have supported a number of them. But we ought to charge them where they are supposed to be charged, and not make the American people think that we are appropriating billions of dollars for the benefit of the farmers of this country, for that is simply not true.

I thank the able Senator from Florida for yielding to me on this point.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Georgia for his able, constructive addition to the debate.

Mr. President, in order that the debate, before it terminates, may show the answer of the Secretary of Agriculture to the request of our committee for the breakdown of expenditures, which we have been talking about in the last few minutes, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter addressed to Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL from Hon. Orville L. Freeman, Secretary, dated February 26, 1962, which is in reply to an inquiry about the item in the report on the appropriations for 1962, which has just been mentioned.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., February 26, 1962.
Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR RUSSELL: The report of the Senate Committee on Appropriations on the 1962 Department of Agriculture and related agencies appropriation bill requested that this Department consult with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget concerning a presentation in the next budget which would delineate more clearly, by programs, those that are chargeable to the farm program as distinguished from foreign assistance. It was also requested that the Department submit a report to the committee setting forth by items the regular programs of primary benefit to agriculture as well as foreign assistance items, with a breakdown of expenditures for each program.

These requests were considered intensively by both this Department and the Bureau of the Budget. The Department explored the purposes of its programs with the view of possibly classifying expenditures according to beneficiary. In this respect it was found that there was no objective way to clearly delineate between specific groups, such as farmers, businessmen, and consumers, since

the benefits of the programs carried out are spread so widely among all segments of the economy. It was concluded that in the interest of a clearer public understanding of the Department's programs, a classification according to major purposes would be more feasible and appropriate.

The discussions with the Bureau of the Budget were therefore on the basis of classifying expenditures according to major purpose or function. In arriving at the classification for presentation to your committee of the programs carried out by the Department, it was the position of the Bureau of the Budget that such classification should be consistent with the treatment accorded the programs of the Department in the functional classification appearing in the President's budget. There is attached a statement showing the expenditures of the Department in fiscal years 1961 and estimated for 1962 and 1963 which reflects the functional classification appearing in the budget, and which provides a breakdown of the programs included in each group. Those programs constituting the food-for-peace effort under Public Law 480 are identified in the breakdown.

We will be glad to furnish any additional information the committee may want on this matter.

Sincerely yours,
ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Classification of expenditures by functions as reflected in the budget for the fiscal year 1963

[In millions]

	1961	Estimated, 1962	Estimated, 1963
International affairs and finance: Economic and financial assistance:			
Food-for-peace (Public Law 480, title II).....	\$199	\$281	\$300
Agriculture and agricultural resources:			
Farm income stabilization and food-for-peace:			
Price support, supply, and purchase programs:			
Present programs.....	1,331	2,497	2,516
Proposed legislation.....			-434
National Wool Act.....	61	67	70
Food-for-peace (Public Law 480, titles I and IV).....	1,455	1,489	1,389
International Wheat Agreement.....	76	81	81
Transfer of bartered commodities to supplemental stockpile.....	201	225	250
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities.....	203	225	235
Conservation reserve.....	363	346	323
Sugar Act.....	72	82	87
Other.....	39	69	68
Subtotal.....	3,801	5,081	4,585
Financing rural electrification and rural telephones:			
Present programs.....	301	330	370
Proposed legislation.....			-136
Financing farm ownership and operation: Farmers Home Administration.....	353	158	198
Conservation of agricultural land and water resources:			
Soil Conservation Service (including watershed protection and Great Plains program).....	146	164	181
Agricultural conservation program, CCC loan for ACP, and emergency conservation measures.....	251	256	257
Research and other agricultural services.....	324	352	380
Total.....	5,176	6,341	5,836
Natural resources: Forest resources:			
Forest Service:			
Payments to Klamath Indians.....	69		
Other.....	246	279	281
Total.....	315	279	281
Health, labor, and welfare: School lunch and special milk programs:			
Present programs.....	241	274	271
Proposed legislation.....			20
Total.....	241	274	291
Grand total.....	5,929	7,177	6,709

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, as one who served as director of the food-for-peace program during 1961 and 1962, I am especially interested in the legislation before us today.

Public Law 480, the legislative authority for the Nation's food-for-peace effort is one of the most important statutes ever enacted by the Congress.

Using our agricultural abundance to reduce hunger in the world is not only in our self-interest but is a tremendous humanitarian achievement.

The food-for-peace program (Public Law 480) stabilizes American farm incomes, reduces costly storages, stimulates our shipping industry, develops new commercial markets, improves the health and economy of other peoples, and promotes the cause of peace and freedom.

It is imperative that we recognize that while the cost of the program is chalked up to the budget of the Department of Agriculture, it is to a considerable extent an arm of our foreign economic aid program.

The supplemental appropriation which we are called upon to approve today is needed to restore the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation resulting from our sales of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies under title I of Public Law 480.

The Commodity Credit Corporation plays an essential role in our entire farm economy and especially in the stabilization of farm prices.

It may be assumed by some persons that we are paying unreasonable prices for price supported commodities. The facts are that the American consumer is getting a remarkably good buy on farm commodities. Consumer food costs are \$4 to \$6 billion a year less than if farm prices had increased as much as prices in other parts of the economy during the past 8 years.

I ask unanimous consent that a paper prepared at my request by Walter W. Wilcox, senior specialist in agriculture of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress entitled "Consumer Savings Due to Decline in Farm Prices and Increased Government Cost of Farm Programs, 1953-54 to 1961-62," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSUMERS SAVINGS DUE TO DECLINE IN FARM PRICES AND INCREASED GOVERNMENT COST OF FARM PROGRAMS, 1953-54 TO 1961-62

Consumers' food costs are \$4 to \$6 billion a year less than if farm prices had increased as much as prices in other parts of the economy in the past 8 years. This amounts to a saving of \$100 per family. These savings may be compared with an increase in Government farm price support costs of \$0.7 billion in the 8-year period (or \$2.4 billion if the cost of foreign assistance programs is added).

IF FARM PRICES HAD INCREASED AS MUCH AS MARKETING AND TRANSPORTATION CHARGES

The Economic Research Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture estimates civilian expenditures for domestic farm food products at \$63 billion in 1961-62. If the farm prices of these domestically produced foods had increased as much between 1953-54 and 1961-62 as the marketing and transportation charges on the foods in the standard farm food market basket, or 17 percent,¹ civilian expenditures for these foods in 1961-62 would have been about \$69 billion, or \$6 billion

higher than they were. This estimate assumes no change in marketing margins due to the higher farm prices.

IF FARM PRICES HAD INCREASED AS MUCH AS WHOLESALE PRICES OF NONFARM PRODUCTS

Wholesale prices of all commodities other than farm products and food increased 10.6 percent between 1953-54 and 1961-62. Had the farm prices of domestic food products increased by this percentage, rather than declining 6 percent as they actually did, consumers would have had to spend \$4 billion more—or \$67 billion—in 1961-62 for their domestically farm-produced foods. This again assumes no change in marketing margins.

IF FARM PRICES HAD INCREASED AS MUCH AS PRODUCTION EXPENSES

In the 8-year period 1953-54 to 1961-62, farm output increased 15 percent. The increased output was due to increased use of fertilizers, insecticides, weedkillers, improved seeds and breeding stock, and other improved practices. Prices paid by farmers for all purchased items, interest, taxes, and wage rates increased 9 percent in the 8 years. Taking into account the larger quantities of purchased materials and the higher prices, production expenses per unit of all farm output, including tobacco and fibers, increased 11.3 percent in the 8-year period. Had farmers balanced their supplies with market outlets, and had farm prices for food products increased by the same percentage as production expenses, civilian consumers would have had to spend \$4.4 billion more than they did spend in 1961-62 for their farm-produced foods. Again, this does not allow for increased marketing margins resulting from percentage markups in the wholesale and retail markets.

IF FOOD PRICES HAD INCREASED AS MUCH AS OTHER ITEMS IN THE CONSUMERS PRICE INDEX

Still another comparison is possible. During this 8-year period, the cost of all items in the consumers price index other than food increased 12.9 percent. If farm prices of food products had increased by this percentage, without any change in marketing margins, civilian consumers would have had to pay \$4.8 billion more annually for their domestically produced foods.

Because of the current organization of the economy and agriculture's rapid technical progress, civilian consumers are paying \$4 to \$6 billion less each year for food than they would be paying if farm prices had increased as much as production costs, or as much as prices in other sectors of the economy, where unused capacity and idle resources are greater today than in agriculture.

INCREASED COST OF FARM PROGRAMS LESS THAN CONSUMER SAVINGS

As compared with the above-estimated consumer savings, budget expenditures from appropriations for programs primarily for stabilization of farm incomes increased from an average of \$1.9 billion per year in 1953-54 to \$2.6 billion a year in 1961-62.² In addition to the cost of programs primarily for the stabilization of farm incomes, budget expenditures for foreign assistance programs or Public Law 480 programs, which began after 1954, averaged \$1.7 billion per year in 1961-62.

Savings in retail food costs per family due to the decline in farm prices in the past 8 years while most prices were rising, average \$100 a year as against increased farm program costs of \$20 to \$40 per family.

¹ 87th Cong., 2d sess. House Department of Agriculture appropriations for 1963, hearings. Pt. 1. Table 5, "Budget expenditures from appropriations," pp. 243-245, and USDA Office of Budget and Finance.

Details of the budget expenditures are as follows (million dollars)

	1953-54	1961-62
Acreage allotments and marketing quotas-----	27.0	70.0
Sugar Act program-----	64.6	75.1
Conservation reserve program-----		348.0
CCC price support and related programs-----	1,582.7	1,691.0
Special milk program-----		89.3
International Wheat Agreement-----	94.9	83.3
National Wool Act-----		63.1
Sec. 32 removals-----	129.6	209.0
Subtotal-----	1,898.8	2,628.8
Foreign assistance: Public Law 480:		
Title I-----		1,454.8
Title II-----	*37.2	220.3
Total-----	1,936.0	4,303.9

*Expenditures for famine relief prior to Public Law 480.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, unless there are other questions to be asked, I hope the Senate will pass the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 284) was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, before the vote on the passage of the joint resolution, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD summaries of certain programs under the Commodity Credit Corporation, together with the statement of the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to the reimbursement of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the status of CCC borrowing.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF EFFECT OF WHEAT AND FEED GRAIN PROGRAMS ON CCC COSTS (ASCS, FEBRUARY 28, 1963)

HIGHLIGHTS INDICATING SUCCESS IN CUTTING SURPLUSES AND REDUCING COSTS

1. CCC holdings of wheat and feed grains were 1.077 billion bushels less on February 15, 1963, than the peak quantities held in 1961 before the new program was effective, and total stocks at the end of 1963 marketing year will be 2,509 million bushels less than they would have been if the pre-1961 programs had been allowed to continue.

2. The fact that the CCC does not now own the 1.077 billion bushels of grain it formerly owned is now saving the Government \$770,000 each day in carrying charges—\$280 million a year.

3. The 1964 budget includes \$246 million less for carrying charges on these grains than was spent in fiscal year 1961, and \$813 million—or \$2.2 million a day—less than the annual rate that would have occurred by 1964 if the pre-1961 programs had been allowed to continue.

These and other figures show that the new programs designed to eliminate the costly and unnecessary surpluses of wheat and feed grains, that had climbed to record levels in 1961, are working.

The Congress has given the CCC the responsibility to finance all Government price

² U.S. Department of Agriculture. Economic Research Service. Table 1. February 1963 (MTS-148).

support and commodity purchase programs through use of its own funds and a borrowing authorization limited to \$14.5 billion. Each year the Corporation's realized losses are met by appropriations by the Congress for restoration of capital impairment. The amount of appropriations needed is determined by CCC's realized losses.

The realized losses of the CCC since 1960 are shown below:

Fiscal year	Realized loss (millions)	
	Amount	Change from preceding year
1961	\$2,067.0	+ \$454.9
1962	2,799.4	+ 732.4
1963 (estimated)	2,753.6	- 45.8
1964 (estimated)	2,646.9	- 106.7

¹ Does not include inventory revaluation loss of \$1,268.5 million applicable to 1961 and prior years.

(1) Fiscal 1962 losses were higher than the previous year, primarily because of:

(a) an increased loss on commodity sales in the disposal of large quantities of corn and grain sorghums acquired from the 1960 and prior years' crops; such grain was acquired at a higher price in the 1950's than market prices in 1962. Obviously as the grain is moved out of surplus into consumption realized losses take place.

(b) increased loss on donations, due to the donation of more dairy products, wheat flour and corn meal, thus increasing benefits to millions of people at home and around the world by a more effective use of our agricultural abundance.

(c) acreage diversion payments to farmers as the immediate cost of launching supply adjustment programs enacted by the Congress—programs that by now have significantly reduced stocks of grain and the costs of both acquiring and carrying such stocks, while they have brought about substantial increase in farm income.

(2) Estimates indicate that realized losses for fiscal 1963 will be \$45.8 million less than for the previous year, and that this encouraging trend will be stepped up in 1964 by an estimated decrease of \$106.7 million below that for 1963.

(3) Stocks in CCC inventory in excess of needs for an adequate reserve have been substantially reduced—by a total of 1.077 billion bushels as compared with peak quantities on hand before programs for supply adjustment began to take effect. As a result, the 1964 budget estimates before the Congress show \$245.6 million less for carrying charges on wheat and feed grains for the fiscal year 1964 than the actual cost in the fiscal year 1961. The fact that the CCC does not now own the 1.077 billion bushels of grain it formerly owned is now saving the Government \$770,000 each day in carrying charges—\$280 million a year.

(4) Cumulative savings of \$480 million in carrying charges on feed grains and wheat from the record 1961 level have already resulted or are budgeted as a result of the decrease in CCC stocks, as follows:

[In millions]

Fiscal year	Total carrying charges, feed grains and wheat	Savings from 1961 level
1961	\$846	-----
1962	776	\$70
1963 (budget estimate)	682	164
1964 (budget estimate)	600	246
Cumulative savings through June 30, 1964, from 1961 level	-----	480

(5) If the new supply adjustment programs had not replaced the pre-1961 pro-

grams it is a conservative estimate that carryover stocks at the end of the marketing year for the 1963 crop would have amounted to 3.8 billion bushels of corn and grain sorghums and 1.6 billion bushels of wheat, and the annual carrying charges on these quantities would have amounted to at least \$1.4 billion by 1964 as compared with the current estimate of \$587 million for these three grains in the 1964 budget. The difference is equivalent to about \$2.2 million per day.

(6) If pre-1961 programs had been allowed to continue and stocks had built up as indicated through 1963, it is estimated that ultimate carrying costs to the CCC before disposal of the additional quantities added to stocks would have amounted to approximately \$3.3 billion. This would result from the time which would elapse before these added stocks would be disposed of, based on the annual rate of disposition which occurred prior to 1961. This would be 10 to 12 years for feed grains and between 6 and 7 years for wheat.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE FOR REIMBURSEMENT TO COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION FOR COSTS OF TITLE I, PUBLIC LAW 480

(Statement of Hon. Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, U.S. Department of Agriculture, before the Senate Committee on Appropriations)

Mr. Chairman, I am here today not to request an increase in appropriations, but rather to ask for a shift in appropriations from fiscal year 1964 to fiscal year 1963. Your authorization of a supplemental appropriation of \$58,172,000 to reimburse the CCC for unrecovered 1963 costs for title I, Public Law 480, will be accompanied by a reduction in our budget request for 1964 by that identical amount.

Congress has given the CCC the responsibility for financing all Government price support and commodity purchase programs through the use of its own funds and a borrowing authorization limited to \$14.5 billion. Because the nature of CCC operations and expenditures are to a considerable extent unpredictable—due to factors such as weather, insect damage, domestic and import demand, trade psychology, and other intangibles—Congress has seen fit to authorize such borrowing and to make up for realized losses by later appropriations for restoration of capital impairment.

There are two circumstances that have brought about the present situation in which the CCC, required by law to carry out price support programs by purchases or loans for such commodities as wheat, cotton, dairy, and feed grains, is faced with resources now at the perilously low level of \$127.6 million.

The first of these circumstances is the fact that the Appropriation Act for 1963 as approved by Congress last year did not include \$831.6 million for reimbursement for past and estimated 1963 expenditures as requested in the 1963 budget.

The second is the combination of unpredictable factors that have resulted in: (1) heavier loans on cotton than expected, largely because mills have postponed buying in anticipation of lower prices; (2) heavier loans on corn than expected, largely because unusually favorable weather produced corn of such high quality that larger amounts went under loan earlier than anticipated; (3) lower sales from CCC stocks than were estimated a year ago.

Action is therefore necessary at this time to provide the CCC with enough operating capital to carry out the price support programs that are mandatory under law, along with its responsibilities for Public Law 480 operations, during the remainder of fiscal

1963. This action will have no effect on the total of the appropriations required for the 2 fiscal years of 1963 and 1964.

STATUS OF CCC BORROWING AUTHORITY CURRENT SITUATION

The Congress appropriated \$832 million less than the amounts requested in the 1963 budget to reimburse CCC for costs of the foreign assistance programs and for realized losses.

This left only a narrow operating margin for changes in the estimates which could result from weather conditions, farmer participation in programs, production abroad, timing of expenditures, and receipts, and other uncontrollable and unpredictable factors.

Available borrowing authority of CCC: With only a narrow operating margin, changes in timing of receipts and expenditures have occurred with the result that CCC's available borrowing authority has dropped to \$149.6 million as of February 18, 1963. Section 4(i) of the CCC Charter Act (15 U.S.C. 714b(1)) prohibits the Corporation from exceeding its borrowing authority of \$14.5 billion. The Corporation has used approximately \$8 billion of the \$14.5 billion borrowing authority in its investment in loans and inventory. The Corporation is required by law to use its borrowing authority to finance costs of the foreign assistance programs (Public Law 480, IWA, Bartered Materials for Supplemental Stockpile).

At the current rate of use, there is grave danger that the entire \$14.5 billion of authorized borrowing authority will be exhausted by the end of February or early in March unless remedial action is taken promptly.

During this period, the Corporation is required by law to carry out certain mandatory programs which require use of sizable amounts of borrowing authority, such as cotton loans (averaging about \$2.5 million per day in February), corn loans (averaging \$9.6 million per day in February) and dairy purchases (averaging about \$1.8 million per day in February). Under the 1963 feed grain and wheat stabilization programs, advance payments are authorized (averaging about \$5 million per day).

STEPS TAKEN TO DATE

Payments to other Government agencies are being held in abeyance; for example, \$15 million to AID for ocean transportation, and \$20 million for loans to the ACP program for advance purchase of conservation materials and services.

Foreign assistance program funds have been shifted from the 4th to the 3d quarter for advance to CCC (\$110 million).

Recovery of \$93.1 million repayments from foreign currency loans was accelerated through special arrangements with the Treasury Department.

Daily reports from field offices are obtained and analyzed on borrowing authority used, cotton and corn loans and repayments, feed grain dispositions, purchases of dairy products, and advance feed grain and wheat payments.

ALTERNATIVES

1. Stop all payments and loans to producers under all price support and related programs. In addition, stop payments due and payable under contracts and firm commitments:

- (a) To warehousemen.
- (b) To rail and truck carriers.
- (c) To processors and packaging firms.
- (d) To vendors of dairy products.
- (e) To U.S. exporters of wheat flour, cotton and cotton products.

(f) To U.S. exporters and U.S. ocean freight carriers for commodities shipped under Public Law 480 (food-for-peace program). Such action would result in a nationwide loss of confidence in the integrity of

the U.S. Government to meet its financial obligations. It would disrupt all phases of the agricultural economy and incur the ill will of farmers and related industries throughout the Nation. It would set off a chain reaction which would be extremely damaging to farmers and people doing business with farmers, with resulting serious damaging effects upon the economy in general.

2. Use of section 32 funds: Section 32 currently finances payments for diversion or export of commodities, and has, in the past, procured commodities from CCC for distribution to domestic outlets. The 1964 budget estimates that in the fiscal year 1963, CCC will donate domestically approximately \$300 million of surplus commodities and will make export payments of approximately \$270 million. In order to lessen the impact upon CCC's borrowing authority, section 32 funds could be used to procure commodities from CCC for distribution to domestic outlets and to finance diversion payments and export payments.

If section 32 funds were used to the maximum extent permitted by available funds and existing authorities, it is possible that up to \$250 million could be advanced to CCC, principally for commodities to be distributed to domestic outlets. In view of the provision in section 32 which limits the amount which can be devoted to any one commodity to 25 percent of available funds, not more than \$150 million could be used for any one commodity; e.g., dairy products.

This large use of section 32 funds for commodities under CCC price-support programs has not been generally favored by members of the appropriation committees, by other Members of Congress and by officials of the Department of Agriculture and should therefore, be avoided, if possible.

3. Provide promptly a supplemental appropriation of \$508 million as requested by the President. There is a budget amendment for 1964 to reduce the 1964 appropriation request by a like amount.

Such action would permit the continuation of CCC operations on a normal basis for the balance of this fiscal year consistent with current estimates.

CCC borrowing authority—Estimated major obligations and receipts
(In millions of dollars)

Item	February	March
Balance available or deficit (—), beginning of month.....	210	—31
REGULAR ACTIVITIES		
Obligations:		
Corn and cotton loans.....	170	53
Dairy purchases.....	62	60
Feed grain and wheat payments.....	131	105
Export payments.....	84	25
Storage, transportation and resale payments.....	43	43
Other purchases, loans, interest.....	80	101
Total obligations.....	570	387
Receipts:		
Corn and wheat sales.....	179	325
Wheat and cotton repayments.....	80	107
Other sales, repayments, etc.....	26	57
Total receipts.....	285	489
Net obligations or receipts (—).....	285	—102
SPECIAL ACTIVITIES (PUBLIC LAW 480, ETC.)		
Obligations.....	169	172
Receipts.....	1213	17
Net obligations or receipts (—), special activities.....	*44	155
Balance available or deficit (—), end of month.....	—31	—84

* February includes \$110,000,000 of reappropriated 4th quarter funds under the foreign assistance program and \$93,100,000 loan repayments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 284) was passed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the acting majority leader. I think it timely to say that, as I recall, not only is this the first appropriation measure of the session, but it is also the first measure of general importance which has been passed. I express the hope that there will be many others to follow soon, and that Congress may be able to adjourn at an early date, as soon as possible after July 31.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Whenever the Senator from Florida handles a measure as he has the appropriation bill today, he always acts with dispatch, efficiency, clarity, and with positive results.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The distinguished Senator from Florida mentioned the date of July 31. I think I should announce at this time that it is not the anticipation of the leadership to have the Senate take an Easter vacation this year because of the fact that we are at least 7 weeks behind in our schedule, and because committees are only now getting down to work. I think it behooves us to stay on the job and do the best we can to get legislation rolling, to the end that it may be possible for us to adjourn some time this year which, I am sure, will not be July 31, but because of the delay which has already been incurred, may well be in October or perhaps November.

Mr. HUMPHREY. O Senator. O Leader.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I had not expected to have my hopes crushed at such an early date; but I cannot help approving the general position taken by the majority leader. We have an immense amount of work to do. While the purpose of my comment was to call attention to the fact that we have finally started to do it, I hope we may proceed much more expeditiously than we have in the recent past.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am happy that, almost 8 weeks after the convening of the 88th Congress, it has been possible, finally, for the Senate to consider a measure and pass it. I believe that the first bill passed this year had to do with a situation in the State of Hawaii. I am delighted that that bill, which was sponsored by Senator Fong and Senator INOUYE, and reported by the Committee on Government Operations, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], has the honor of being the first bill to be passed by the Senate after almost 8 weeks of effort, of a sort.

I am especially happy that the first measure of major significance on a na-

tionwide basis is the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 284) which was reported by the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, which was also passed today.

I compliment the Senator from Florida for the skillful, sound generalship he always shows in the consideration of a bill, and also the fact that in explaining a bill he proves to us conclusively that he does his homework and knows whereof he speaks.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my friend, the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MAINTENANCE OF HIGHEST MEDICAL STANDARDS IN VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there has been considerable discussion and concern in certain departments of the Veterans' Administration relating to the medical and hospital care of veterans. Today I wish to address myself to these developments and to set at rest some of the worries and concerns of many Members of the Senate. I have received letters from Members of Congress, as well as from many veterans' representatives and organizations relating to the medical care program of the Veterans' Administration.

Throughout my service in the Senate, it has been my pleasure to devote attention to one of the most important obligations of the Nation: Providing the finest possible medical care for our wounded and ill ex-servicemen.

I should like today to mention some of the great medical challenges and opportunities which the Veterans' Administration faces.

A BRIEF VA MEDICAL HISTORY

First, however, a bit of historical perspective is necessary.

I will not recapitulate in detail the history of the Veterans' Administration medical program. I will only say this: This Nation today conducts the finest medical program in the world for those who defended it on the field of battle.

The program was not always thus. There was a time when Veterans' Administration medicine was the victim of an appalling combination of indifference, politics, the worst forms of bureaucracy, and professional mediocrity.

Then a great revolution occurred. It rightly bore the title, informally, of two of its great leaders, Dr. Paul Hawley and Dr. Paul Magnuson. After a time, however, that great reform movement itself ran into difficulties and was on the point of collapse. At that point—in 1951—a U.S. Senate subcommittee, of which I

was privileged to be chairman, stepped in and, observers said, saved the day.

That was 12 years ago. Since then, Veterans' Administration medicine has enjoyed outstanding esteem in the eyes of the medical world—and rightly so.

But times and circumstances change. Today, Veterans' Administration medicine confronts significant, albeit more subtle, challenges than in years gone by.

Fortunately, the outlook for those challenges to be successfully met is very bright.

FULL SUPPORT AT HIGHEST LEVEL

President John F. Kennedy and Administrator John S. Gleason are determined that Veterans' Administration medicine shall achieve new peaks of professional excellence.

The three great foundations of medicine—medical care, medical research, and medical education—are each being strengthened.

The key to Veterans' Administration's medical future lies, in considerable part, in the competent hands of the Nation's great medical schools. Today, 87 of the 170 Veterans' Administration facilities are affiliated with 77 medical schools. Some hospitals have multiple affiliation. In each of these hospitals, what are known as deans' committees help to assure the highest possible medical standards.

I cannot speak too strongly of the importance of this type of dynamic, high-level medical sponsorship and monitoring.

As a June 1960 report by a National Academy of Sciences Survey Committee stated on page 2:

The total effectiveness of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration is undoubtedly more dependent on cooperation with the medical schools than on any other single factor. In the future, with an increase in the competition for professional personnel expected, this relationship will assume even greater importance.

NEED FOR HIGHER PAY

Meanwhile, the Congress, itself, as always, has a vital role to play. This particularly is the case in enabling the Veterans' Administration to compete successfully in the job marketplace, as I have indicated.

The 88th Congress must, in my view, enact additional Federal salary reform legislation. Only thereby can it enable the Veterans' Administration to recruit and keep the highest caliber of medical and paramedical personnel.

A Federal professional pay schedule should be adopted by Congress. If we are to maintain the technical, scientific, and medical personnel the Government requires for providing service to veterans, to the general public, and to the scientific institutes and medical institutes in this country, Congress must promptly act on the professional salary schedules needed to recruit and hold personnel of this kind.

On May 16, 1962, Administrator Gleason made a very strong and well-merited plea, before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, on behalf of an adequate system of compensation for Veterans' Administration medical per-

sonnel. Many of the observations which he made at that time might well be repeated today. Today the Veterans' Administration cannot effectively compete in the job market with other public and private sources. It has not been able to keep pace with compensation available elsewhere.

The greatest threat today to the medical and surgical programs of the Veterans' Administration is the failure of Congress to adjust the professional salary schedules so that trained and competent scientific personnel can be maintained on the job.

THE MENTAL ILLNESS AND REHABILITATION REVOLUTIONS

Yet, Mr. President, the Veterans' Administration medical program is subject to dynamic change. A great revolution in chemotherapy of tuberculosis has been followed and paralleled to some extent by a revolution in what is known as psychopharmacology. A magnificent opportunity to reduce mental illness confronts the Nation. This is subject, of course, to the proviso that we proceed with all due safeguards in the case of the many powerful new mind medications.

All the while, the Nation's veterans' population is itself subject to the factor of time and aging. More and more, the Veterans' Administration is confronted with the problems of the chronic illnesses and disability characteristic of advanced years.

The Veterans' Administration is beginning pioneering efforts in establishing restoration centers. The Veterans' Administration faces the great opportunity of not only adding years to lives, but also adding lives to years for our senior veterans. More and more, the concept of restoration must take hold. We should not be content until, if it is at all possible, we enable the senior, ill veteran to return to society.

APPREHENSION OVER TRANSFER OF AREA MEDICAL DIRECTORS

In view of all these significant challenges facing the Veterans' Administration, I was particularly concerned in recent days to note much apprehension—as I have already said—among experts as to one particular administrative move in the offing. I refer to the transfer to Washington of the Veterans' Administration area medical directors.

I shall not go now into this subject in detail, except to say that men of unimpeachable medical credentials have expressed to me deep concern over this relocation. Outstanding among those who view the move with deep misgivings is Dr. Paul Magnuson.

Every veteran and every veteran's family in the Nation owes Dr. Paul Magnuson a debt of gratitude for his reforms in the Veterans' Administration's Medical and Surgical Division. He made veterans medicine the finest medicine practiced today in America.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McIntyre in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to join in the tribute to Dr. Magnuson. I know of no one in public life who has performed a more significant service than that which Dr. Magnuson has performed for our veterans. No words of praise are too strong for the services of this distinguished man to the Government, and particularly to veterans.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from New York for his words of commendation of Dr. Magnuson, and also for his joining me in this expression of our appreciation and our respect for him. Of course, I may also include—as I have previously said—Dr. Hawley, Admiral Booth, and the other medical directors who have served the veterans of this country so faithfully.

I have discussed the issue of the relocation of certain area medical directors at high levels within the executive branch. I have been assured that the move will not impair the professional integrity of the Veterans' Administration medical service in any way, and that it will advance administrative efficiency.

I do not presume to render final judgment on the issue. In all frankness, I have strong doubts over the wisdom of moving Area Medical Directors away from the scene of their immediate responsibility. Inevitably, they will have to spend more time in travel to the field. Inevitably they will become more associated with the Washington scene than they will with the scene and the problems in the areas concerned.

DANGER OF INTERFERENCE WITH VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION MEDICINE

What is more, I am distressed that the move was ordered from the Office of the Administrator, initially unknown to and over the head of the Veterans' Administration Medical Director. The latter was confronted with what amounted to an accomplished fact.

The able Veterans' Administration Medical Director has stated that he does not share this concern over the geographic relocation. I respect his judgment and that of the Administration. But I remind the Veterans' Administration that the Congress has expressed in unmistakable terms the position that the Veterans' Administration Medical Department shall be professionally independent. I have high regard for Mr. Gleason. He is doing a good job as Administrator, and I believe his staff is also doing a good job. But I have previously watched efforts to change the pattern of the Veterans' Administration medical care. I have seen attempts made to get it back into the old bureaucracy, subject to the pressures which come from many political sources. We are not going to let that happen again.

As I have said, in 1951 it was my privilege to step in and stop such a move. This afternoon, I repeat the warning that if there is any attempt to put Veterans' Administration medical and surgical programs under some form of political influence or administrative control that would violate medical standards and professional medical care, I will

wage battle against whoever attempts to do it.

In the past, Dr. Magnuson recalls time after time when changes which were regarded as relatively innocuous have been part of a systematic pattern of interference with the professional independence of Veterans' Administration medicine. I repeat: I serve notice that I, for one, do not intend to be silent in the face of any such effort, now or in the future.

That is no threat. It is merely a statement of my concern in respect to the program. I have watched the program for the past 12 years. I have visited many of the veterans' hospitals. I shall do all I can to see that the existing high professional standards are maintained.

The Veterans' Administration's assurances over the situation cannot, however, be lightly dismissed.

At a December 3, 1962, meeting of the Veterans' Administration's Special Medical Advisory Group, Mr. Gleason stated the following noteworthy reasons for bringing the area medical directors to Washington:

To improve communications between the field and the central office staff; to establish one point of contact in central office for each hospital director; to utilize the central office staff to provide technical program guidance and to advise hospital directors; to provide more uniform supervision and evaluation of field station operations, and to involve those with the most intimate knowledge of field operations (the area medical directors, themselves) in the development of top-level policies and plans.

Dr. William S. Middleton, the present Veterans' Administration Chief Medical Director, is a fine and able public servant. He has volunteered the belief, based on his experience in serving under three Administrators of Veterans' Affairs, that no Administrator has more staunchly supported the Department of Medicine and Surgery than Mr. Gleason. He has strengthened Veterans' Administration ties with deans' committees of the Nation's medical schools; he has insisted that Veterans' Administration hospitals be built near medical schools; he has supported the record appropriations for care and treatment of veterans patients, hospital construction, and medical research.

Mr. President, I concur in Dr. Middleton's opinion. Mr. Gleason is making a fine record as the Veterans' Administrator. I wish to support his efforts. But I want him to know that some of us are standing guard to see that nothing happens to weaken the independence and the professional competence of the medical section of the Veterans' Administration.

The geographic relocation, Mr. Middleton feels, in no way minimizes either the prerogatives or duties of the Area Medical Director or of the Chief Medical Director.

In summary, the move is regarded, at least by Veterans' Administration, as within the authority of the Administrator, and has been accepted by the Chief Medical Director, who has, as I have indicated, given assurances that it will in no way whatsoever detract from direct patient care.

I have gone into that question with considerable care. I have had a staff member of the Senate Subcommittee on Reorganization look into this situation carefully. My remarks today are the result of that study.

The Congress, however, is under no obligation to accept the relocation, particularly without further examination. I, for one, respectfully suggest that the Senate and House Appropriations Subcommittees with jurisdiction over the Veterans' Administration may wish to look into the merits and disadvantages of the geographic shift. In addition, perhaps our colleagues in the expert House Veterans' Affairs Committee may wish to explore the problem.

Certain people in Veterans' Administration were apparently planning to order the move as far back as 6 years ago. Yet, Mr. Gleason has only been in office 2 years. So, I do not want anyone in Veterans' Administration to get the idea that henceforth the Director of the Medical Department can again be circumvented and presented with an accomplished fact. Nor do I want them to get the idea that the Medical Advisory Committee can be told that a move is going to take place, instead of being consulted whether the idea of a move is sound.

The Medical Advisory Committee is supposed to give advice and not just act as a sounding board for decisions already taken.

In conclusion, I intend to give Veterans' Administration medical needs my close attention. I have ordered my staff on the subcommittee to keep a watchful eye over the program. As a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, I am going to keep two watchful eyes on the program.

I may add, on this last point, that while Veterans' Administration has an outstanding record in many respects as regards interagency cooperation, we have found, in some areas—notably as regards drug communication—much to be desired.

So that this record will be complete and so that perspective will be maintained, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a Washington Post editorial of February 3, 1963, as regards the relocation move.

I also would like to outline briefly the work performed by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Subcommittee in 1951 as referred to in the above editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERANS' MEDICINE

That indefatigable watchdog of the Veterans' Administration, Dr. Paul B. Magnuson, is barking again. Experience has made it altogether plain that his warnings ought not to be ignored. Politicians and organized veterans' groups, he says, are making another grab for control of VA medicine.

A dozen years ago Dr. Magnuson was fired from his position as director of medical affairs for the Veterans' Administration. The resulting commotion produced a Senate investigation by a subcommittee under the chairmanship of Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY which completely vindicated Dr. Magnuson and blamed the Veterans' Administrator of

that time, Carl R. Gray, Jr., for developments which "could conceivably return the VA medical care program to the shambles which made it a national scandal in 1945."

Dr. Magnuson had been fired because he objected vigorously to directives which would have brought the management of Veterans' Administration hospitals and medical facilities directly under the authority of the Administrator, bypassing the Director of Medical Affairs. Now, he asserts, incumbent VA Administrator John S. Gleason, Jr., has inaugurated a similar move, ordering VA regional medical directors to move their offices to Washington and report directly to a deputy VA medical director; and this has been done despite opposition by the retiring Medical Director.

It is easy to understand why a Veterans' Administrator would like to centralize control over medical affairs under his own direct supervision. But there are serious dangers, as Dr. Magnuson has pointed out, in "interference with medical matters by the Administrator which may have a direct bearing on the care and treatment of patients and hospitals." It was precisely this kind of interference which Senator HUMPHREY's investigating subcommittee excoriated 12 years ago. Perhaps it had better have a fresh look at the situation. The Nation has an inescapable obligation to see to it that the medical care provided for veterans is of the highest professional caliber and wholly free from political overtones and influences.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The danger of collapse of medical reforms within the Veterans' Administration was the subject of an urgent study made in 1951 by a Special Subcommittee To Investigate Veterans' Administration Policies and Practices With Respect to Medical Care.

It was my privilege to serve as chairman of this subcommittee. Four other Members served on the subcommittee: the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], and the then Senator Richard M. Nixon, of California.

The subcommittee heard direct testimony from Gen. Carl Gray, then Veterans' Administrator, and Dr. Paul B. Magnuson, who had served as Chief Medical Officer until January of that year. All in all, the subcommittee conducted 9 hearings, in February, March, and May 1951, with 25 witnesses. In addition, the subcommittee met in five other sessions at which operations were planned, testimony was analyzed, and recommendations were formulated.

On August 2, 1951, it was my pleasure to file the report of the subcommittee, as approved by the full committee. It appeared as Senate Report No. 610, 82d Congress, 1st session. The report was endorsed by leading medical experts throughout the Nation. It became, they said, a "benchmark" for the highest caliber medical policies in Veterans' Administration. The report itself stressed the role of the deans' committees.

It had reprinted—pages 4-6—the Veterans' Administration policy memorandum No. 2, dated January 30, 1946. That memorandum was entitled "Policy in Association of Veterans Hospitals With Medical Schools." Under it, it noted, each affiliated school of medicine organized a deans' committee, which assumed responsibility for the schools' functions in the program. The deans' committees usually consist of senior fac-

ulty members from all schools cooperating in each project, whether or not furnishing any of the attending or resident staff.

The report emphasized, in recommendation No. 1, page 41, that the Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration must be the principal medical authority of the agency with primary authority to control, manage, and operate its medical and hospital program. It recommended that the Chief Medical Director be appointed by the President, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate—page 45—that the Special Medical Advisory Group be strengthened and be given every possible help.

The report emphasized—page 46—that the medical program on behalf of our Nation's veterans "must be kept dynamic and alert to the continuous scientific advances that are being made in hospital care."

It stressed that "affiliation of hospitals with the medical schools is the only way this can be successfully accomplished." It pointed out that the relationship must rest on mutual confidence and cooperation.

The underlying spirit and guidelines of the report merit, I believe, continued heed and respect.

There is no substitute for professional excellence in medicine and in all the healing arts.

LABOR DEPARTMENT—50 YEARS LATER

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, today we celebrate a significant milestone in the life of our Nation on this, the 50th anniversary of the Labor Department.

Dedicated to promoting the welfare of the wage earner in this country, to improving his working conditions, and to advancing his opportunities for profitable employment, the Department has advanced these goals with distinction.

It has been most instrumental in fostering the dignity of labor in a free society, and on the occasion of its 50th anniversary, I wish to offer my congratulations to the Department, as well as my deep appreciation for the role it has played in seeing to it that the price we pay for our industrial achievements is no longer measured in terms of human sacrifice.

From its small beginnings in 1913, the Department has met the challenges of changing times as the prime architect of our manpower policies in this country. Its able and dedicated Secretaries have helped the Department acquire a reputation for thoughtful and impartial devotion to integrity and objectivity among employers, unions, and the public in general.

Fifty years ago the workingman of this country was ill paid, ill housed, ill fed, and unprotected. Fringe benefits were almost nonexistent. There were few laws governing the safety and health of the workingman, or the child laborer. While prices were lower, the purchase of basic necessities took a far larger bite out of the workingman's pay than is now the case.

Today most of our children are protected against industrial exploitation. The sweatshops and yellow dog contracts are a thing of the past. Wages and working conditions have improved dramatically. Under the influence of many Federal laws, organized labor has risen from a position of ineffectual weakness to one of balanced power with management—a balance that is absolutely necessary to the achievement of the goal outlined by the first Secretary of Labor, "Industrial peace through progressively nearer realization of the highest ideals of industrial justice."

Yes, we have come a long way from the dark days of industrial life in the United States, and much credit must go to our present Secretary of Labor, Willard Wirtz, and all his distinguished predecessors.

But as Secretary Wirtz has pointed out, the challenges facing labor-management relations today are at least "equal in magnitude" to the challenges of 1913. And a key question is, in his words: "Can we make our economy a human as well as a technical success?"

The fact is that, despite areas of affluence, mass poverty still exists in the United States today. Millions of people are still ill paid, ill housed, ill fed, and unprotected. While real wages have been increasing for everyone, the greatest gains are occurring at the upper end of the income scale, not the lower. In fact, the poor are even poorer today than they were years ago in terms of the percentage of the national income they are receiving. And the rate at which poverty is being eliminated has slowed down alarmingly since 1953, according to a recent eloquent article in the New Yorker by Dwight MacDonald.

High and persistent unemployment remains an unsolved problem of the greatest magnitude, and it is being increasingly aggravated by the accelerating rate of automation. We are not only faced with the problem of the millions of unskilled or poorly educated workers who cannot find jobs in the pages of want ads for engineers, scientists, and managerial executives that fill our papers every day, but we are also faced with the problem of people who, because of automation, suddenly find their skills obsolete. They may be ill suited or too old for retraining, or the job opportunities that are available may be far from the communities in which these people have planted deep roots.

In the face of these great challenges to the ability of labor-management relations in a free and democratic society, I have been increasingly disconcerted by the extent to which we, as a nation, seem to have forgotten the lessons of the past.

I have heard people so enraptured by the processes of automation that it seems they will not be satisfied until the last workingman is replaced by a machine. It seems to have escaped many people that the secret of our country's economic success has been the distribution of greater purchasing power in the hands of more and more working men and women, not fewer. Economic prosperity does not lie down the path of fewer jobs, more machines, and a

wealthy elite to run them. Automation will indeed be a cruel triumph unless it leads to the creation of more new jobs than it displaces.

Increasingly we seem to hear cries for legislation designed to drastically upset the balance of power between labor and management that has slowly developed over the years, without realizing the implications of the proposed remedy.

Whenever a major, prolonged strike occurs, people begin demanding anti-strike legislation and compulsory arbitration in order to protect what they consider the public interest.

Surely we need better mechanisms for dealing with major labor-management disputes, but keeping in mind the importance of a balance of power between labor and management in our kind of society, what power would organized labor have without the right to strike? And if we are to turn the question of wages and working conditions over to the Government or some designated third party, what possible reason would there be for not doing likewise for prices and profits? And then where would we be?

It seems to me that anyone truly interested in the preservation of the private enterprise system as we know it today would think long and hard before recommending such drastic remedies to the problem of major and prolonged strikes affecting the national interest.

The pressure to place labor under the jurisdiction of the antitrust laws also seems to me to be poorly thought out.

The purpose of the antitrust laws is to promote competition among the industries of the Nation to prevent monopoly control over the production and prices of the commodities we need. Aside from the fact that it is pretty difficult these days to find price competition in buying a car, gasoline, and other major commodities, we cannot forget that labor is not a commodity. We are not trying to promote the competition for jobs, or competition to see how little one union is willing to have its members paid.

But even assuming that unions have achieved too much power over the ability to determine wages and working conditions through the economic consequences of their right to strike, what evidence is there that the decentralization of union power would lessen the number of strikes or make labor more "responsible" or less "demanding"? It might, in fact, work just the other way around, for it is quite possible that union officers exercise a restraining influence on their members more often than the members exercise a restraining influence on the union officers.

One could go on to examine other proposals that have been made from time to time, which are based on the premise that "labor has grown too strong," but most of them seem designed to either plunge us back to the dark ages of industrial strife or involve the most dangerous degree of Federal intervention and control.

We have achieved, after years of strife and turmoil, a rough balance of power between labor and management in an atmosphere of freedom from government control.

It is not a perfect arrangement, and sometimes when bitter disputes develop, the public interest suffers very greatly. And at present our only real bulwark lies in the sense of responsibility and fairness on both sides.

But as I believe Winston Churchill once said in another context:

Democracy is the worst form of government in the world—save all the rest.

Just so, one can argue that the present relationship between labor and management is the worst possible way to serve the interests of our Nation as a whole, but it beats any other system devised so far by mere human beings.

For the accomplishments we have achieved, let us be thankful on this 50th anniversary of the Labor Department, which deserves great credit for those accomplishments. At the same time, let us look for constructive ways to improve the equilibrium of labor-management relations in keeping with the traditions we value as a nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD news articles from the Washington Post and Washington Star, and an editorial commemorating the 50th anniversary of the U.S. Department of Labor.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 4, 1963]
LABOR'S 50 YEARS

As the country observes the 50th anniversary of the Labor Department today, there is a strong inclination to dwell upon the accomplishments of the last half century. The gains for labor have been enormous. When President Taft fixed his signature on the Labor Department bill, the 7-day week was still common, wages were low, child labor was prevalent, safety measures were meager, sick leave, paid vacations, and many other benefits were still dreams of the future. The occasion is likely to be meaningful, however, to the extent that it is used for assessment of the enormous problems still on the labor horizon.

Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz thoughtfully observed that, as his Department begins its second half century, "it carries much of the responsibility for a major decision we must face as a people: Can we make our economy a human as well as a technical success?" The task of the Department is very different from that of 1913, but in many respects it is more baffling and infinitely more complicated.

Today the country is keenly aware of the need for 4 million additional jobs. With all the advance in technology and productivity, the goal of full employment is still elusive. Workers are troubled by the consequences of automation; employers, by the consequences of featherbedding. As a nation, we have an appalling amount of idleness and underutilization of energy and skill. Yet, on the other hand, there are mountainous needs that remain unfilled and surplus capacity and production that are not put to constructive use.

If any simple solution of these maladjustments were at hand, it would doubtless have been applied long ago. In the absence of such a solution, the Labor Department will have a constant struggle to improve the lot of the workingman or, as Secretary Wirtz put it, to make change "the instrument for man's deliverance, instead of permitting it to become the instrument for his destruction."

Fortunately, it is now recognized that improved well-being for the rank and file is itself the goal, although there remains much controversy over how this can best be attained. One thing is certain: the problem will require continued intensive study by the best minds in labor, industry, and Government. And since the Labor Department will remain close to the center of the struggle, it will need to gird itself for still more intensive service.

[From the Washington Star]
LABOR DEPARTMENT'S FULL 50 YEARS
(By Truman R. Temple)

It took agitation by the labor movement from the end of the Civil War to the eve of World War I to create it.

When the Department was created by a stroke of President Taft's pen on his last day of office March 4, 1913, 18,000 children were working underground in mines.

Two years earlier, 146 workers at the Triangle Waist Co. in New York had been killed in a fire. A little-known social worker named Frances Perkins, who happened on the scene, watched in horror as some of the women leaped from windows to their death. She later pushed through a new State code for factories before becoming Secretary of Labor.

THE CLIMATE

Five men were killed in work accidents for every million tons of coal mined in 1913. One railroad worker in 500 lost his life on the job. Less than half the States had any workmen's compensation laws. Unemployment insurance did not exist, and 23 years would pass before it came into being.

It was this kind of climate that gave birth to the U.S. Department of Labor. Tomorrow President Kennedy will join with labor and management leaders at a banquet in the Sheraton-Park Hotel celebrating the agency's 50th birthday, in a climate so changed that observers would be hard pressed to find any similarities with 1913.

Today the American wage earner is the envy and the model for the rest of the world. A large measure of his well-being can be attributed to the Department here that administers the many laws protecting him.

In its first half century, the Labor Department has scored some unusual firsts. It was the first of Cabinet rank to be headed by a woman, Frances Perkins—who incidentally will attend tomorrow's ceremonies.

Her appointment by F.D.R. in 1933 was not hailed with joy by American unions. The head of the AFL said Miss Perkins was a charming lady but unacceptable to organized labor. Unimpressed, she went on to hold office for 12 years, longer than any other Secretary before or since.

Labor also remains the smallest of all Cabinet rank departments, with only 8,642 employees last year compared to 64,762 in Interior, 110,934 in Agriculture, over 1 million in the Defense Department. And its budget was \$563 million, compared to \$873 million for Interior, \$7.1 billion for Agriculture, and \$49 billion for Defense.

Among other firsts, Labor can claim authorship of the alltime publication, "Infant Care," first printed in 1913. More than 45 million copies have been published and a new 11th edition will appear next month.

THE PRESENT SECRETARY

The current Secretary, W. Willard Wirtz, is considered the wittiest of Cabinet members. He once served as a member of the Illinois Liquor Control Commission and of the Winnetka, Ill., Library Board for 5 years, and recalled later, "I got to the point that every time I opened a book I felt compelled to open a bottle. It was a spiritual experience, and one which I must say prepared me for this tour of duty in Washington beyond any I can imagine."

Should the Labor Department race from one major strike to another like a Federal fire department? Under Secretary Goldberg, now safely transferred to the quieter realm of the Supreme Court, it often seemed so. In fact aids once contemplated equipping his office with an alarm bell and fire chief's hat.

DIFFERENT IDEAS

But neither Mr. Wirtz nor Miss Perkins hold this view, though the present Secretary has won some notable settlements. "Many people have the idea," Miss Perkins said on the Department's 25th anniversary "that the Government has the right to intervene in strikes and settle disputes, to step in between warring labor factions."

"It cannot dictate any settlement in either case. If it could, this country would not be a democracy. This Department can only help each side to see the other's point of view and to endeavor to point a way to a settlement which will be satisfactory to both sides."

In any event, it seems likely no Labor Secretary could sustain Mr. Goldberg's phenomenal run of luck in ending strikes including one at the Metropolitan Opera, traditional haven of temperament, even if he wanted to. And as one observer warned on White House interventions, "If the President hangs out his shingle, he's going to get all the business."

Like others before him, the present Labor Secretary sees the Department's basic challenges in long-range problems of full employment, manpower retraining and the like.

He accepts the problems of change, even though he once remarked that history "ought to be arrested for reckless driving." In looking back at the Department's first half century, Mr. Wirtz notes that change has been its steady companion.

In World War I it was embroiled in supplying manpower to win the war. In following years it worked for more security for workers hit by technological change to mass production.

MANY ACTIVITIES

After the 1929 crash, the Department added many activities—the national employment service, wage and hour law enforcement, apprenticeship and training, and new labor standards to improve working conditions.

In this era other agencies were removed, including Immigration and Naturalization, the Children's Bureau, and the Mediation and Conciliation Service. The Hoover Commission urged putting some back, but they remain elsewhere.

As Mr. Wirtz remarks, in a statement prepared for its golden anniversary tomorrow, "The history of the Department is thus a record of response to change, always the welfare of the American worker and his family dominating the aims, thoughts, efforts and actions of the Department."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Mar. 3, 1963]

LABOR DEPARTMENT IS 50 YEARS OLD, AND IT
TOOK A TAFT TO START IT
(By Morton Mintz)

Although the Government had been in labor since 1884, when it established a Bureau of Labor in the Interior Department, it didn't give birth to a full-fledged Department until March 4, 1913.

The 29-year gestation period ended when President William Howard Taft, on his last day in office, signed the law bringing the Department of Labor into the world—a world in which the working man, the working woman, and the working child need all the help they could get.

Monday is the 50th anniversary of the Department. The anniversary will be observed with regional banquets and conferences in 16 cities.

The Washington banquet, which will follow other special events during the day, will be held Monday night at the Sheraton Park. President Kennedy, Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz, three former Secretaries—Frances Perkins, James P. Mitchell, and Justice Arthur J. Goldberg—and leaders of industry, the AFL-CIO, and the three branches of Government are among those scheduled to attend.

TO IMPROVE CONDITIONS

The law that created the Department said its purpose was "to foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, to improve their working conditions, and to advance their opportunities for profitable employment."

Today few would question that the law's purpose reflected compelling needs.

A 1913 Government report, for example, said that almost 30 percent of the Nation's steelworkers were on a 7-day week, that some worked 18 to 24 hours without letup, and that two out of five worked 72 or more hours a week.

The report said that 42 percent were earning less than 18 cents an hour, with a weekly potential maximum of \$12.50. From their pay, deductions were made for such things as ice water, disablement funds, medical fees, rent for company houses and identification badges.

Owning almost everything in towns where many workers lived, employers could charge what they wished for rent, transportation, and even food.

In the 1st decade of the 20th century there were few laws governing safety, health, sanitary conditions, or child labor. Sick leave, paid vacations, and other fringe benefits were virtually unknown.

A common laborer toiled 50 hours a week for an average of \$11—and a child may have worked beside him under dangerous conditions. Illness or old age could cut off his income.

More than 40 percent of his take-home pay went for food, beverages, and tobacco—compared with about 25 percent today. A suit of clothes took 75 hours' work—compared with 20 hours today.

To the Department's 10th Secretary the task today is equal in magnitude to the challenges of 1913.

In an anniversary statement, Wirtz said that the Department "carries much of the responsibility for a major decision we must face as a people: Can we make our economy a human as well as a technical success?"

The Secretary said that we have today "an economy so forward and aggressive in its technical ability that it has outstripped the skills of millions of persons, deprived itself of that many consumers, and come to an impasse of demand. . . ."

"As framer of the manpower policies of this Nation, the Department of Labor must keep pace with the scientific advancements that offer promise of man's fulfillment.

"We have the responsibility of developing those programs which will safeguard the person who may, as an individual, be adversely affected by a technological development which greatly benefits the community as a whole. . . ."

"We are going to have to review our seniority, our job-right systems, our employment security programs, and our retirement programs in order to find ways of insuring man's rights despite his displacement by a machine."

Of the four units that comprised the Department when it was born, only the Bureau of Labor Statistics remains in it. Within the last quarter century the Bureau of Immigration was transferred to the Justice Department and the Children's Bureau to what is now the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Mediation and Conciliation Service has become an independent agency.

But changing times have brought changing needs, and the Department's activities and responsibilities are now of a scope that could not have been imagined 50 years ago.

EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

They include career counseling for women, reemployment help to veterans, the U.S. Employment Service, training in labor subjects for about a thousand foreign visitors annually, apprenticeship and training programs, publication of the Dictionary of Occupational Titles (a new edition will list about 40,000), studies of the chronically unemployed, thousands of investigations to assure compliance with the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act, help in retraining jobless workers (an estimated 400,000 in the next 3 years) and enforcement of fair labor standards.

"During its first half century of service to the United States," Wirtz said, "the concern of the Department of Labor can be expressed in one word: People. Human welfare remains its interest."

CREATION OF IDAHO TERRITORY

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, 100 years ago yesterday this body amended and passed House bill No. 738. The House of Representatives subsequently concurred in the amendments, passed the bill, and it was rushed to the White House and there signed—on March 3, 1863—by President Abraham Lincoln.

This was the historic legislative act, Mr. President, which created the Territory of Idaho.

Establishment of this vast government, which included much of the present States of Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming—as it was first created—was the preliminary to Idaho's entrance into the Union as the 43d State. Even then, statehood did not come until 1890.

In 1863, this new territory was a mountain wilderness, and other than various tribes of Indians, its only population several thousand miners who had flocked to rich diggings on the Clearwater and Salmon Rivers in the north and Boise Basin in the south.

It has been said that Idaho was born in a gold pan; it was not until after 1860, when a handful of adventurers led by Capt. E. D. Pierce, discovered gold on Orofino Creek in the Clearwater River watershed, that a brave young population washed into the mountain wilderness and set up housekeeping. Prior to this, only hardy Mormon settlers from Utah had ventured into southern Idaho seeking a permanent settlement; this region was primarily a path for the Oregon Trail, and before that had known only the explorers and the fur traders.

But with the wave of miners came a demand for foodstuffs, freighting, professional services, and other requirements for existence. Settlements grew where trails bisected the mining traffic, and roads followed. Establishment of the Territory in 1863 brought the framework for law and order, social and economic progress.

It is remarkable that a Congress, so concerned with the problems of a tragic war, could at this particular time respond to the needs of tiny frontier settlements more than 2,000 miles to the west. I have just completed reading the Con-

gressional Globe, forerunner of our present CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for the 3d session of the 37th Congress, which convened on December 1, 1862, and adjourned in March 1863. In these detailed accounts of the debates concerning the war and its many ramifications, is sandwiched the story of the creation of Idaho Territory. It is most interesting to note that but for the lateness of the bill's consideration, and the insistence of Senator Henry Wilson, of Massachusetts, Idaho Territory might never have existed but would have been Montana Territory instead.

An outstanding historian-teacher of Idaho, Miss Annie Laurie Bird, of Nampa, recently suggested that the account from the Congressional Globe might well be compiled in digest form for the benefit of future historians. I believe this should be done in this territorial centennial year, and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to insert in the RECORD these highlights of that important and historic legislative action.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Congressional Globe, Dec. 15, 1862 (House)]

PROPOSED NEW TERRITORY

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. I was absent when the State of Illinois was called, and ask consent now to introduce a resolution of inquiry.

No objection being made, Mr. Kellogg, of Illinois, submitted the following resolution; which was read, considered and agreed to:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Territories be instructed to inquire into the propriety of establishing a territorial government for that region of country in which are situate the Salmon River gold mines; and that they report by bill or otherwise."

[From the Congressional Globe, Dec. 22, 1862 (House)]

TERRITORY OF IDAHO

Mr. Ashley also introduced a bill to provide a temporary government for the Territory of Idaho; which was read a first and second time, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

[From the Congressional Globe, Feb. 11, 1863 (House)]

TERRITORY OF MONTANA

Mr. Ashley, from the Committee on Territories, reported back House bill No. 626, to provide a temporary government for the Territory of Montana; which was ordered to be printed, and recommitted to the same committee.

[From the Congressional Globe, Feb. 12, 1863 (Senate)]

BILLS INTRODUCED

Mr. Lane, of Kansas, asked, and by unanimous consent obtained leave to introduce a bill (S. No. 521) to provide a temporary government for the Territory of Montana; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

[From the Congressional Globe, Feb. 12, 1863 (House)]

MONTANA

Mr. Ashley, from the Committee on Territories, reported back House bill No. 738, to provide a temporary government for the Territory of Montana, with the recommendation that it do pass.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Minor changes in wording of bill made following debate.)

Mr. Allen, of Ohio, demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and it was decided in the affirmative—yeas 85, nays 39.

So the bill was passed.

[From the Congressional Globe, Feb. 13, 1863 (Senate)]

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Etheridge, its Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (No. 707) making appropriations for the construction, preservation, and repairs of certain fortifications and other works of defense for the year ending 30th of June 1864; and

A bill (No. 738) to provide a temporary government for the Territory of Montana. (The bill was referred to the Committee on Territories.)

[From the Congressional Globe, Saturday, Feb. 14, 1863 (Senate)]

REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

Mr. Wade, from the Committee on Territories, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. No. 738) to provide a temporary government for the Territory of Montana, reported it without amendment.

[From the Congressional Globe, Mar. 3, 1863 (Senate)]

PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENTS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The Senate began consideration of S. No. 200, a bill to establish provisional governments, and a move to "lay it on the table" failed; a move to adjourn the Senate also failed.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a question before the Senate. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Virginia to the amendment of the Senator from New York to Senate bill No. 200.

Mr. WILKINSON. I move to lay aside the pending bill and all other orders, and take up House bill No. 738, providing for a temporary government for the Territory of Montana.

Mr. HARRIS. I hope not.

Mr. WILKINSON. This bill has passed the House of Representatives, and I think it is necessary that it should pass this body. I am in favor of the bill which is now before the Senate, but I do not believe it can pass; or if it passes this body, it certainly cannot pass the other. It seems to me entirely futile to undertake to press it at this late day of the session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota moves to postpone the pending bill and all prior orders, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill indicated by him.

Mr. HARRIS. I hope that motion will not prevail. I hope we shall have action on this bill. * * * The question is whether or not the President shall go on appointing Governors for the rebel States, as we get possession of them, without any authority, perhaps, of law, as a mere matter of necessity, or whether we shall regulate it by act of Congress * * *.

Mr. WILKINSON. If I thought the Senate could come to any decision on the Senator's bill without a long discussion, I would not urge this motion; but I do not believe it can. I believe there is great diversity of opinion here, and I am satisfied the bill will be strenuously opposed. I therefore move that it be laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to consider the bill which I have named.

Mr. SUMNER. I would suggest to my friend from Minnesota that perhaps it would be better to proceed with the consideration of the bill now in charge of the Senator from

New York. If there be such opposition to it as the Senator anticipates, we shall then know it. I am not aware of it now. Besides, the Senator says if the bill passes the Senate, it cannot pass the House of Representatives. Now, I am of opinion that if it passes the Senate it can pass the House of Representatives.

Mr. WILKINSON. I may be mistaken about that.

Mr. SUMNER. That is my idea; and on the whole, I think we had better make the experiment.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I agree with the Senator from Minnesota. I am a practical man. I do not believe, practically, that you can pass this bill through the Senate and the House of Representatives at the present stage of the session. It is a bill which will necessarily lead to debate both in this House and the House of Representatives; and we are now in the last day of the session. The bill which he proposes to take up, to organize the territory of Montana, is a practical measure; it has passed the House of Representatives; it is simply pending in this body, awaiting action here. We can take it up and pass it. It is important that it should be passed. The territory of Montana is an important territory, with great gold mines in it, and with a large population in it already.

Mr. GRIMES. Where is it?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. North of Utah, taking what lies east of Oregon and east of Washington territory, and north of Utah, and taking a portion of Dakota, embracing the fine gold mines and a large population.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Some debate left out here.)

Mr. NESMITH. I trust that the motion of the Senator from Minnesota will prevail. There is a very great necessity for the organization of the proposed territory. There are today from 15,000 to 20,000 persons there. They are remotely situated, some 500 or 1,000 miles from any seat of government. There have been recent discoveries of rich gold mines there; and I have no doubt that within the next 4 or 5 months there will be 50,000 or 60,000 people there, who will be entirely without law or municipal regulation for their government unless this bill shall pass. A class of people go there whom it is necessary to have some regulation to control. I trust therefore the bill will be taken up for the benefit of the people who are there without law and without government.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I do not forget that this is the last evening of the session. Now, sir, in relation to the bill to organize the territory of Montana, if I am correctly informed, it is a bill of very doubtful expediency, and one which may well be postponed until another session of the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Minnesota that the Senate postpone the pending and all prior orders, and proceed to the consideration of the bill to organize the territory of Montana.

Mr. HARRIS called for the yeas and nays; and they were ordered.

Mr. HOWE. I beg to offer just this word upon this motion; I shall vote against it, because however important it may be to organize a government for the territory of Montana, I do conceive and submit that its importance is utterly insignificant compared with that of organizing governments for this large body of people, spread out between us and the Gulf of Mexico, who for the last 2 years have been subject to two rules, a military rule, which, however well adapted it may be to the government of military men, is utterly unfitted for the government and regulation of civil society * * *.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Senators here continued their discussion of the bill to provide provisional governments.)

Mr. HARDING. Mr. President, the territory proposed to be organized under a territorial government by the bill referred to by the Senator from Minnesota has not at this time a population exceeding probably 5,000. During the last summer, in the mining district known as the Salmon River mines, there were probably 10,000 persons. The usual severity of the winter in that country has induced most of those miners to leave there and go to the lower country for the winter. Since August, other mines have been discovered on Boise River, where there are now probably from two to three thousand miners at work, according to the best information we can get. In the Salmon River mines there are now probably one, two, or three thousand miners altogether.

The territory included in the boundaries fixed in the bill contains but little agricultural country, and there are, probably, not today more than a few dozen families residing within that territory; but all the accounts we receive from there show that the mines are very rich, and that large numbers of people intend to go there early this spring. I suppose the prospects of the territory are as good today as the prospects of Nevada were the day its territorial organization was completed.

As the bill now stands I cannot vote for it, because it does not include the population east of the Cascade Mountains who desire a territorial organization; but by a proper amendment I think the bill can be made a good one. I hope it will be taken up and amended, and then passed.

Mr. LANE of Kansas. The Senator from Oregon, in his estimate of the population, does not count the people on the eastern slope of the mountains.

Mr. HARDING. That is so. I know nothing of the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains on this side. I only speak of the western side.

Mr. LANE of Kansas. The delegate from Dakota estimates the number of miners on the eastern slope of the mountains as equal to the number given by the Senator from Oregon, which would make a population of from 8,000 to 10,000 persons. I do hope that the Montana bill will be passed; and that then we shall take up the bill to enable Nevada and Colorado to form State governments, and pass them.

The question being taken by yeas and nays on Mr. Wilkinson's motion, resulted—yeas 22, nays 13.

TERRITORY OF MONTANA, OR IDAHO

So the motion was agreed to, and the bill (H.R. 738) to organize the Territory of Montana was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. WILSON of Massachusetts. I move to strike out the name of the territory, and insert "Idaho." Montana is no name at all.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I hope not. I hope there will be no amendment at all. Montana sounds just as well as Idaho.

Mr. WILSON of Massachusetts. It has no meaning. The other has.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. It has a meaning; it refers to the mountainous character of the country.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARDING. I move to strike out of the first section all after the words "to wit," in the fourth line, to the word "the" in the 26th line, being the boundaries of the proposed territory, and in lieu of the words stricken out to insert:

"Beginning at a point to the middle channel of the Snake River, where the northern boundary of Oregon intersects the same; then following down said channel of Snake River to a point opposite the mouth of the Kooskooskia or Clearwater River; thence due north to the 49th parallel of latitude; thence east along said parallel to the 27th degree of longitude, west of Washington; thence south along said degree of longitude

to the northern boundary of Colorado Territory; thence west along said boundary to the 33d degree of longitude west of Washington; thence north along said degree to the 42d parallel of latitude; thence west along said parallel to the eastern boundary of the State of Oregon; thence north along said boundary to the place of beginning."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

Mr. WILSON of Massachusetts. I renew the amendment to change the name from "Montana" to "Idaho."

Mr. DOOLITTLE. As the bill has already been amended, and will have to go back to the House of Representatives, I do not care much about the name; and if it pleases my honorable friend from Massachusetts to call it Idaho instead of Montana, I am willing to yield to his suggestion.

Mr. HARDING. I think the name of Idaho is much preferable to Montana. Montana, to my mind, signifies nothing at all. Idaho, in English, signifies "the gem of the mountains." This is a mountainous country, and the name Idaho is well understood in signification and orthography in all that country; and I prefer it to the present name.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time. The bill was read the third time.

Mr. CARLILE called for yeas and nays on the passage of the bill, and they were ordered; and being taken, resulted—yeas 25, nays 12.

So the bill was passed.

The title was amended by striking out "Montana" and inserting "Idaho."

[From the Congressional Globe, Mar. 3, 1863 (House)]

TERRITORY OF MONTANA

An act (H.R. 738) to provide a temporary government for the Territory of Montana, returned from the Senate with amendments.

The amendments were read.

Mr. ASHLEY. I move that the House nonconcur in the Senate amendments, and ask a committee of conference.

Mr. SARGENT. I hope that will not be done. I should somewhat hesitate to try the experiment of the gentleman from Ohio, a friend of this bill, at this very late hour of the session, thereby sending it back to the Senate, and hence to a committee of conference. I am as desirous of the passage of this bill as he is, but at the same time it is better to concur in the Senate amendments as they now stand, rather than to risk the loss of the bill entirely.

Mr. ASHLEY. I am very much obliged to the gentleman from California for his advice. The Committee on Territories have had this matter in charge, and I ask this House to nonconcur in the Senate amendments, and ask a committee of conference.

Mr. SARGENT. I was not offering advice to the gentleman from Ohio. I do not presume to give him information on this or any subject; but as the bill relates to the erection of a Territory upon the Pacific, and as I am anxious for the passage of the bill, as I believe the gentleman himself is, I suggested to the House—not to the gentleman—that it might be well not to hazard the passage of the bill by nonconcurring in the amendments of the Senate at this late hour of the session. That seems to me to be good policy. I made the suggestion to the House, and the gentleman is under no obligation to me. I call the previous question.

The previous question was seconded, and the main question ordered.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Is this a mere contest between the two names of Montana and Idaho?

Mr. ASHLEY. Oh, no; there is a change in the boundaries as well as in the name. I

call for tellers on concurring in the amendments of the Senate.

The tellers were not ordered.

The amendments were concurred in—yeas 65, nays 33.

[From the Congressional Globe, Mar. 3, 1863 (Senate)]

BILLS BECOME LAWS

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Nicolay, his Secretary, announced that the President had this day, approved and signed the following bills and joint resolutions:

A bill (H.R. No. 738) to provide a temporary government for the Territory of Idaho.

SETTLEMENT OF GENERAL ANILINE & FILM CORP. CASE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, last year I was pleased to support the bill authorizing the sale of the last major industry still held by the Federal Government under the alien property laws. Litigation over the ownership of General Aniline & Film Corp. had continued for many years. It had come before the Supreme Court on two occasions. During this extended period, the corporation did not develop its full potential. It was clear that, if General Aniline was to grow and extend its employment rolls, it should compete in the market on the same basis as did other private firms and under private management. The bill we passed last year was the necessary first step in bringing about that result.

Yesterday the Attorney General announced that an agreement for the sale of General Aniline had been completed. I ask unanimous consent that a press release from the Department of Justice concerning this matter be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
March 3, 1963.

Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy today announced that the Department of Justice has secured an agreement in principle which will permit the Government both to sell the General Aniline & Film Corp. and to conclude 20 years of legal dispute over its ownership.

Mr. Kennedy said the agreement was reached with representatives of Interhandel, a Swiss holding company, which since 1943 has contested the Government's seizure of General Aniline as an enemy asset in 1942.

If the agreement is approved by Interhandel's stockholders and the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, the Attorney General will be able without further litigation to sell General Aniline on a competitive bid basis as authorized by Congress last fall, and divide the proceeds according to specific terms.

Mr. Kennedy said the exact amount each side would receive cannot be known until the sales price is known. However, if the sales price, as an example, is \$200 million, the Government would receive about \$140 million and Interhandel about \$60 million, Mr. Kennedy said. If the price were \$250 million, the Government's share would be about \$170 million and Interhandel's about \$85 million.

If the sales price were higher, Mr. Kennedy said, both the Government and Interhandel would receive correspondingly larger amounts.

General Aniline, known as GAF, is a large chemical and dye manufacturer, whose prod-

ucts include Ansco photographic equipment. Its headquarters are in New York City and it has plants in New York, New Jersey, Alabama, California, Kentucky, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Texas.

The Government seized 93.5 percent of the stock of the company in 1942 as a German asset under the Trading With the Enemy Act. Interhandel began administrative recovery action February 1, 1943, and took the case to the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, October 29, 1948.

Interhandel has claimed that it, a Swiss corporation—and thus not a company of an enemy country—owned 89 percent of the stock seized. The Government has contended that Interhandel did not own the stock but was in reality a cloak for the actual owner, the I. G. Farbenindustrie, A.G., a giant German industrial firm.

The case has gone to the International Court of Justice once, the Supreme Court of the United States twice, the court of appeals a number of times and still has not come to trial. The case now is before a special master appointed by the district court.

Mr. Kennedy said Interhandel stockholders are expected to vote on the proposed settlement this month. If they approve, the Government and Interhandel would enter into a consent judgment, subject to the approval of the district court.

"The General Aniline Co. has been controlled by the Government through four administrations," Mr. Kennedy said. "The Government has sought to let the company operate in as free and competitive a manner as possible. In recent years, the company has done well and its net income in the first 6 months of 1962 was the highest in history."

"Nevertheless, our fundamental aim throughout has been for the Government to step out of its unnatural role as the owner of a private corporation, and to end the extensive litigation in this case."

"It is already the second oldest proceeding still pending in the Department of Justice. Substantial questions of fact and law still remain to be decided, both in American courts and in the International Court of Justice. Such litigation might last for a decade or longer."

"Even if the Government were to seek to sell General Aniline, as authorized in the Sales Act," Mr. Kennedy said, "the Government would be faced with from 1 to 3 years of litigation over its right to do so." "As soon as we would try to sell," he said, "the constitutionality of the Sales Act almost certainly would be challenged immediately."

"This settlement would permit us to sell the company to the highest American bidder; to increase considerably the war claims fund with our sales proceeds; to settle the pending claims in an equitable manner; and to bring to an end one of the longest and most complex court actions in history."

Since Interhandel has contested the ownership of only 89 percent of the GAF stock owned by the Government, the first 11 percent of the sales proceeds would go to the Government.

The proposed settlement provides that Interhandel and the Government each will receive half the proceeds from the remaining 89 percent. However, the settlement also provides that Interhandel, out of its share, would pay the Government nearly \$24 million and will assume the defense of claim by 1,800 stockholders who have intervened in the suit, paying such claims as may be successful.

The \$24 million payment would be for a disputed tax claim of \$17,500,000 against Interhandel and for \$6,430,000 on Interhandel shares previously accepted by the Government as dividends.

The proposed settlement also provides that the Government would retain \$5,277,000 in

cash dividends and cash seized at the time of the General Aniline seizure.

Interhandel representatives have given assurances that payment to the Swiss will be accomplished in a manner which will not adversely affect the U.S. balance-of-payments position.

The Attorney General will appoint a committee of financial experts to advise him on when and how to conduct the sealed-bid sale in order to secure the highest price. Mr. Kennedy said he would request Interhandel to suggest the name of at least one American expert to serve on this committee.

Government proceeds from the sale of GAF would go, by law and like other proceeds from alien property sales, into the War Claims Fund. This fund is used to pay claims to American citizens for injuries and property damage suffered at the hands of enemies during World War II and for other claims authorized by Congress.

Legal negotiations were conducted over a period of months with Dr. Alfred Schaefer, chairman of the board of Interhandel, John J. Wilson, Washington counsel for Interhandel in the long litigation and other representatives of the company, Mr. Kennedy said.

Interhandel's full name is the Societe Internationale pour Participations Industrielles et Commerciales S.A. "Interhandel" comes from its name in German, the International Industrie und Handelsbeteiligungen A.G., previously known as I. G. Chemie. The firm's headquarters are in Basle, Switzerland.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am glad to see this long-delayed move get underway. I commend the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], for their persistence in bringing about the passage of the enabling legislation; and I commend the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] for his long study of the basic problem of vested enemy assets. I hope we will see the fruits of this sale in the form of higher employment, a vigorous management policy, and increased competition in the industry.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, last year Congress enacted legislation permitting the early return of the vast General Aniline & Film Co. to private American enterprise after 20 years of Government control. A bipartisan group in the House and Senate—led by Representatives HOWARD W. ROBISON and LEO O'BRIEN—joined several of us in the Senate in bringing this legislation to fruition after many years of delay and obstruction by its opponents. It was our view that this important company and its thousands of employees could reach levels of growth and prosperity under private enterprise which could not possibly be attained under continued Government management.

The Department of Justice has advised me that passage of this General Aniline & Film Co. sale legislation significantly strengthened the Government's hand in the negotiations leading to a settlement of the long drawn-out litigation over the ownership of General Aniline & Film Co. and that the actual sale of General Aniline & Film Co. will be accomplished on a competitive bid basis as authorized in the sale legislation. Certainly all of those who worked

for the sale bill are delighted with its important contribution to the Government's efforts in this case.

It should be made clear, however, that under our bill, General Aniline & Film Co. could have been sold without any settlement of the pending suit and that nothing in our bill required a settlement on any particular terms.

It was the publicly stated position of the Department of Justice that any challenge to a sale of General Aniline & Film Co. during the pendency of the ownership litigation would be successfully overcome within a year.

Under these circumstances the terms of settlement are bound to strike some observers as extremely generous from the point of view of the United States. What the United States has agreed to, in effect, is a 50-50 split with Interhandel in the proceeds of the sale of the contested shares of stock with Interhandel agreeing to absorb tax and other claims in the neighborhood of some \$24 million out of its share. The net total payment to Interhandel under these arrangements could exceed \$60 million.

Any settlement of this magnitude deserves close scrutiny to make certain that it is in the interests of the United States. In the first instance, this will be the task of the district court, which will have to approve any consent judgment submitted by the parties. But, Congress also has a legitimate concern in this transaction, and congressional study of the settlement would not be at all inappropriate.

There is no suggestion that the Department of Justice has not been sufficiently zealous in the protection of the interests of the United States in arriving at this settlement. I recognize as a lawyer that there is no certainty in any lawsuit and also that a settlement will lead to the disposition of GAF with the least amount of further delay.

At the same time, we cannot lose sight of a number of salient facts: First, that GAF is an extremely valuable asset of the Government; secondly, that hundreds of millions of dollars have been realized by the Government for payment to American war claimants out of the sales of other vested assets, in most cases with no settlement at all with the former owners and in no case with a settlement approaching this amount; thirdly, that any amount paid to Interhandel as a result of the sale of the stock of GAF will reduce the funds which would be available for payment to American war claimants—some of whom have received nothing on their war claims to this very day.

Charges have been made that a Government deal to turn GAF over to a Swiss cartel has been concluded under the direction of William H. Orrick, Jr., now Deputy Under Secretary of State and formerly Assistant Attorney General. The settlement announced today makes it obvious that these charges are without foundation. Under no view of the settlement can it be fairly said to constitute a transfer of GAF to Swiss control. On the contrary this settlement will guarantee, in accordance with the GAF sale bill, that GAF will be sold to American interests and never be re-

turned, whether to its former German or alleged Swiss owners.

In order that the record may be complete on this issue, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in my remarks the text of a February 13, 1963, letter from me to Mr. Orrick on this very point and Mr. Orrick's reply of February 19.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 13, 1963.

MR. WILLIAM H. ORRICK, JR.,
Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ORRICK: It has been reported to me that you are in charge of negotiations for a possible settlement of the General Aniline case.

As you know, legislation was enacted during the last session of Congress authorizing the Government to sell this property despite the pending litigation as to its ownership. In my judgment, the continued operation of this company under Government management is a severe handicap to its growth and prosperity. Its sale to private enterprise on favorable terms, therefore, is a matter of considerable importance to the thousands of employees of the company and the communities in which it operates.

In the hearings on this legislation, Government representatives expressed complete confidence in the ultimate outcome of the pending litigation and any new suit challenging the constitutionality of the sale bill. Under these circumstances, I am concerned about the reports that the Government is contemplating a settlement which may involve a substantial payment to the litigants and which may serve to delay unreasonably the Government's disposition of this property.

Since this is a matter of particular importance to several areas in the State of New York, I would appreciate your furnishing me with full information with respect to this situation.

Your cooperation, as always, is very gratifying.

Very sincerely yours,

KENNETH B. KEATING.

FEBRUARY 19, 1963.

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: I have your letter of February 13 and appreciate your natural concern in the disposition of the General Aniline case.

As you undoubtedly know, I was intimately involved in this case when I was Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Civil Division. However, since I have been working in the Department of State for the last 9 months, I no longer have any direct responsibility over the General Aniline case, nor am I in charge of any of the negotiations which may look toward the eventual settlement of the case.

I can assure you, however, that from my experience in the Department of Justice and from my knowledge of the Attorney General's view of the case, the Government would not enter into any settlement which did not coincide with a fair estimate of the Government's case on the merits, or which would unreasonably delay the Government's disposal of the property.

May I suggest that the present officials in the Department of Justice would be in a better position than I to furnish you with a more complete and up-to-date status of any negotiations which may be in progress.

With best wishes, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM H. ORRICK, JR.

Mr. KEATING. As will be noted, Mr. Orrick's reply categorically denies that he has had any direct responsibility over the General Aniline & Film case since joining the Department of State or that he is in charge of any of the negotiations which may look toward the eventual settlement of the case. I am disclosing this exchange of correspondence at this time in fairness to Mr. Orrick.

It may very well be that Swiss pressures were a factor in the willingness of U.S. officials to agree to the generous terms of this settlement. The General Aniline & Film litigation has been an irritant in United States-Swiss relations ever since Interhandel filed its suit, and I know that our Ambassador to Switzerland has been anxious for a settlement. In these circumstances, it is not unlikely that foreign policy considerations played as important a role as the merits of the case in inducing the United States to accept a 50-50 share of the proceeds with Interhandel.

General Aniline & Film is a major American concern with important facilities in a number of areas in New York. My major concern always has been to allow this company to operate under conditions which would best promote the welfare of the communities in which it operates and its thousands of employees. For this reason I am gratified that as a result of the General Aniline & Film sale bill we have moved very close to the day when this company can become part of the mainstream of our free enterprise system and reach its full potential of growth and prosperity, for the benefit of the stockholders, the employees, and the communities where the plants are located, all of whom have been unanimous in their desire to remove the dead hand of the Government from this company and return it to the free enterprise system.

I am hopeful also that this objective will be accomplished in a manner which fully protects and safeguards the interest of the United States.

CONTRADICTIONS ON CUBA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, as new and alarming information on Cuba comes to light, many persons are asking if the United States suffers from an intelligence gap.

It is becoming clearer each day that no such gap exists. The events of the past year, as the story of Soviet-Cuban aggression has slowly and painfully unfolded, have shown that our intelligence community is hard at work, producing accurate information—in other words, “doing the job.”

We do suffer, however, from unwillingness of our top officials to believe what our intelligence produces, from attempts to gloss over facts revealed by our intelligence, and in some instances attempts to suppress information entirely.

Last weekend the testimony of the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Mr. John McCone, given before the House Foreign Affairs on February 19, was released. His statements directly contradict Secretary of Defense McNamara's incredible assertions that Cuba

is not being used as a base for subversion against other Latin American countries, and fully confirm statements I made on the Senate floor on January 31.

This is another of many striking instances in which high Government officials have first denied, then admitted, facts I have disclosed about Soviet activities in Cuba. These examples strongly suggest that the crisis of confidence now existing is more the result of refusal to convey hard truths to the American people than any gap in our intelligence capabilities.

On January 31 I said, with reference to Soviet activity in Cuba:

What they are planning to do—in fact they are already doing it—is mount an increasing wave of sabotage, terrorism, political subversion and agitation throughout Latin America. Already riots in Venezuela, Peru, Brazil clearly and demonstrably are the work of Communists trained and armed in Cuba.

This was emphatically denied from the top level within a week. On February 6, in a 2-hour television presentation on Cuba, the Secretary of Defense said:

I have no evidence that Cuba is being used as a base for subversion directed against Latin American countries. It is a matter that is of constant interest to us and one we are monitoring continuously.

If our Government is “monitoring continuously,” as the Secretary said, how do we account for what happened only 8 days later? On February 19, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency flatly contradicted the Defense Secretary's statements. Mr. McCone told the House Foreign Affairs Committee:

Fidel Castro is spurring and supporting the efforts of Communists and other revolutionary elements to overthrow and seize control of the governments in Latin America.

At another point, Mr. McCone states:

Some guerrilla forces in Peru are equipped with Czech weapons which most probably came from Cuba.

How did that get by the “continuous monitoring” of the Secretary of Defense?

Mr. McCone also revealed that the trainees in Cuba are instructed to operate rifles and machineguns they would presumably steal or capture from local police or security units. They are being taught how to manufacture homemade “Molotov cocktail” bombs.

Comparing the terrorist tactics of the early Castro days with the present training, Mr. McCone said:

Today the Cuban effort is far more sophisticated, more covert, and more deadly. In its professional tradecraft, it shows guidance and training by experienced Communist advisers from the Soviet bloc, including veteran Spanish Communists.

From a news conference held February 28 we learned that Soviet bombers have been tracking U.S. aircraft carriers for some time. An announcement of flights which occurred from January 27 to February 22 was made, according to news reports, 6 days later, on February 28. Interestingly enough one of the Soviet planes flew over the carrier *Forrestal*, just off Gibraltar, on February 22. Many are wondering whether the fact

that a group of editors and publishers were aboard, and saw the overflight, encouraged the Defense Department to at last release this interesting information the day before the *Forrestal* docked with the newspapermen aboard.

Examples such as this suggest that the crisis of credibility is not the result of any intelligence gap but rather the result of a gap in disclosing information to the public.

According to many reliable press reports covering the events of the past year, CIA Director McCone was warning as early as last August that the Soviets probably would place offensive missiles in Cuba. As substantiation for his position gradually came into the public view—first through unchecked refugee reports, then through thoroughly checked intelligence material, and later through statements of alarmed Members of Congress of both parties—our Government kept busy denying everything. At last, on October 22, when the President clamped down a blockade, the frightening facts were suddenly officially unloaded on the American people.

There are disturbing indications that an attempt is being made to use the intelligence community as a scapegoat and whipping boy for the present crisis of confidence in the Government's handling of the Cuban situation. No intelligence system is perfect, and it may be that problems of coordination and cooperation have hampered the CIA's effectiveness on some occasions. In my judgment, however, we would be placing the onus on the wrong source if we blamed the fact gatherers rather than the policymakers for the failure to give the American people an accurate and complete picture of Communist activities in Cuba.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENTS TO COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] to fill the Republican vacancy on the National Forest Reservation Commission.

The Chair appoints the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] chairman of the Special Committee on Aging, and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM], as members of the special committee.

To the Mexico Interparliamentary Group, the Chair appoints the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE],

the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM], and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Thursday, March 7, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 4, 1963:

UNITED NATIONS

Charles F. Baldwin, of the District of Columbia, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Federation of Malaya, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the representative of the United States of America to the 19th session of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

U.S. MARSHAL

Paul G. April, of New Hampshire, to be U.S. marshal for the district of New Hampshire for the term of 4 years, vice Royal Dion, resigned.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Brig. Gen. Robert F. Seedlock, U.S. Army, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission, under provisions of section 2 of an act of Congress, approved June 28, 1879 (21 Stat. 37) (33 U.S.C. 642), vice Brig. Gen. Jackson Graham, reassigned.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Liberty B. Todd, Attalla, Ala., in place of W. L. Mason, deceased.

William H. McCarty, Moulton, Ala., in place of J. C. Weatherwax, deceased.

ARKANSAS

Leslie H. Johnson, Hackett, Ark., in place of O. E. Mathis, retired.

Milton M. Hemingway, McGehee, Ark., in place of H. G. Boyd, deceased.

Joe D. Taylor, Plainview, Ark., in place of Leola Garner, retired.

James E. Landes, Stamps, Ark., in place of B. R. Tatom, transferred.

CALIFORNIA

Laura B. Morgan, Clayton, Calif., in place of J. D. Bloching, resigned.

Alice O. Mills, Finley, Calif., in place of D. K. Manning, retired.

Edgar L. King, Stratford, Calif., in place of O. L. Edman, retired.

Lee B. Downs, Whittier, Calif., in place of W. H. Mitchener, retired.

DELAWARE

Thomas Holcomb, New Castle, Del., in place of A. P. Gallagher, retired.

FLORIDA

Myrla M. Bishop, Archer, Fla., in place of E. L. Grantham, retired.

Ross C. Marler, Destin, Fla., in place of Nellie Baker, resigned.

Ruth A. Childers, Florahome, Fla., in place of F. R. Cook, deceased.

J. Donald Carter, Fort Myers Beach, Fla., in place of Charles Wyland, deceased.

Daniel D. Clements, Land O'Lakes, Fla., in place of A. M. Douglas, retired.

A. Edward Hoyt, Port Richey, Fla., in place of T. R. Hillsamer, resigned.

GEORGIA

Charles E. Garrett, Alley, Ga., in place of G. B. McIntyre, retired.

Newt S. Hinton, Porterdale, Ga., in place of B. C. Chapman, retired.

C. Wayne Shannon, Preston, Ga., in place of J. S. Rees, transferred.

IDAHO

Don C. Chrystal, Bovill, Idaho, in place of E. R. David, retired.

Elmer M. Fetzner, Paul, Idaho, in place of E. R. Morgan, retired.

ILLINOIS

James C. Hobbs, Abingdon, Ill., in place of J. W. Lucas, resigned.

Charles E. Resch, Anna, Ill., in place of Frank Keistler, Jr., declined.

Peter W. Bast, Ashland, Ill., in place of Pearl Caswell, removed.

Lola M. Baumunk, Bardolph, Ill., in place of J. L. Baumunk, retired.

Rudolph E. Beranek, Berwyn, Ill., in place of J. J. A. Borkovec, retired.

Joseph F. Alfeld, Carrollton, Ill., in place of M. D. Dowdall, retired.

Verna H. Welsh, Durand, Ill., in place of Lillie Doyle, retired.

Arthur J. Lawrence, East Alton, Ill., in place of E. R. Hill, deceased.

Richard C. Hazer, Elizabeth, Ill., in place of E. J. Coveny, deceased.

Robert A. Smith, Elvaston, Ill., in place of J. N. Cunningham, retired.

Clifford L. Lehman, Eureka, Ill., in place of C. B. O'Marah, retired.

William H. Haycraft, Franklin, Ill., in place of W. A. Tranbarger, transferred.

Charles J. Nash, Greenville, Ill., in place of D. J. McAllister, retired.

Edythe A. Grover, Hamburg, Ill., in place of E. F. Day, retired.

Paul D. Jordan, Herscher, Ill., in place of A. C. Westphal, retired.

L. Dale Wingo, Kenney, Ill., in place of Enid Trowbridge, retired.

Dona J. Beard, Leaf River, Ill., in place of A. L. McCaw, resigned.

Richard J. Thilmoney, Loda, Ill., in place of H. E. Goodell, retired.

Ora K. Reid, Media, Ill., in place of R. E. Sullivan, deceased.

John R. Ryan, Mundelein, Ill., in place of C. E. Teson, retired.

Morris A. Mettendorf, Neoga, Ill., in place of J. V. Worland, retired.

Anton Macrowski, Jr., North Chicago, Ill., in place of W. H. Woodard, retired.

Norbert W. Haberer, Pocahontas, Ill., in place of H. F. Mounger, transferred.

Leo A. Hayes, Ramsey, Ill., in place of O. W. Hinton, removed.

Charles F. Schultz, Reynolds, Ill., in place of B. W. Sharp, retired.

Leonard M. Koerberlein, St. Elmo, Ill., in place of P. E. Ball, retired.

Wendell L. Smith, Sandwich, Ill., in place of J. R. Montgomery, retired.

G. Kenneth Furrer, San Jose, Ill., in place of F. E. Smith, retired.

W. Rex Butler, Saybrook, Ill., in place of E. E. Tipson, transferred.

G. Clark Ewing, Sheldon, Ill., in place of W. G. McEwan, deceased.

Ralph F. Bennett, Sidell, Ill., in place of C. W. Fyle, retired.

William J. Murphy, Stockton, Ill., in place of F. C. Niemeyer, deceased.

Kenneth B. Lorenson, Sullivan, Ill., in place of G. C. Miller, retired.

Gerald A. Melvin, Tamaroa, Ill., in place of J. E. Lee, removed.

Edwin B. Wirth, Techny, Ill., in place of W. E. Halvey, resigned.

William E. Morgan, Tennessee, Ill., in place of B. P. Hodges, retired.

Dorothy E. Anderson, Thomasboro, Ill., in place of A. J. Ulrich, retired.

Donovan O. Hutchins, Viola, Ill., in place of F. H. Weihler, transferred.

John R. Graves, Virginia, Ill., in place of C. R. Wilson, retired.

Warden D. White, Wayne City, Ill., in place of Ira Dezouche, retired.

INDIANA

Andrew E. Street, Crane, Ind., in place of J. F. O'Neal, retired.

Charles R. Forgey, Freetown, Ind., in place of C. J. Bebout, retired.

George R. Bills, Lewisville, Ind., in place of G. C. Davison, retired.

IOWA

Clifford S. Heng, Cylinder, Iowa, in place of Mary Coway, retired.

Iva M. Mauck, Garwin, Iowa, in place of E. L. Ochs, retired.

Don H. Richards, Hinton, Iowa, in place of W. A. Spies, transferred.

Cecil C. Ramsdell, Toledo, Iowa, in place of C. E. Brandt, retired.

Glenn W. Fleck, Vinton, Iowa, in place of H. E. Carrier, resigned.

KANSAS

Burgess L. Stephenson, Leoti, Kans., in place of E. F. Giesick, transferred.

KENTUCKY

Edward A. Runyan, Marion, Ky., in place of H. G. McConnell, deceased.

James C. Tracy, Smithland, Ky., in place of H. B. Rappolee, retired.

LOUISIANA

Rhea L. McIlvaine, Cotton Valley, La., in place of J. A. Moody, retired.

Nelson J. Falcon, Duson, La., in place of R. D. Comeaux, transferred.

Frances B. Farmer, Princeton, La., in place of A. H. McWilliams, resigned.

MAINE

Lorraine J. Bragdon, North Vassalboro, Maine, in place of M. E. Donnelly, retired.

Lloyd E. Beckett, Thomaston, Maine, in place of D. P. George, retired.

MARYLAND

Richard H. Bates, Branchville, Md., in place of F. K. Hazard, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Harry W. Vozella, Franklin, Mass., in place of C. H. Carlson, retired.

MINNESOTA

Charles C. Lenz, Ellsworth, Minn., in place of L. N. Riley, retired.

Harold A. Legatt, Rice, Minn., in place of M. A. Marchand, transferred.

MISSISSIPPI

Norman E. Snowden, Collinsville, Miss., in place of I. E. Blanks, retired.

Samuel L. Westmoreland, Houka, Miss., in place of A. N. Graves, retired.

MISSOURI

Lawrence O. Kinyon, Forsyth, Mo., in place of J. V. Moore, retired.

MONTANA

L. Preston Blakeley, Absarokee, Mont., in place of J. W. Campbell, retired.

Lols M. Walker, Wolf Creek, Mont., in place of M. E. Jacobson, retired.

NEBRASKA

Donald F. Carey, Bancroft, Nebr., in place of W. C. Schleusener, retired.

Norman I. Anderson, Concord, Nebr., in place of E. J. Hughes, retired.

NEVADA

Maxine A. Anderson, Verdi, Nev., in place of E. E. Ubbins, deceased.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Roger E. Hebert, Hooksett, N.H., in place of D. P. St. Germain, deceased.
Martin J. Keenan, Jr., Peterborough, N.H., in place of M. J. Keenan, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Calvin L. Naylor, Blackwood, N.J., in place of J. A. Beetle, resigned.
Joseph J. Stahley, East Brunswick, N.J. Office established April 1, 1959.
Thelma C. Cooper, Navesink, N.J., in place of C. C. Cooper, deceased.
Richard M. Johnson, Ridgely, N.J., in place of H. J. Forman, deceased.

NEW MEXICO

R. Warner Dutro, Anthony, N. Mex., in place of A. N. Ealy, removed.
Artenia L. Crick, Williamsburg, N. Mex., in place of T. B. Williams, removed.

NEW YORK

John P. Frey, Atlantic Beach, N.Y., in place of Catherine Damme, retired.
James F. Hill, Centerport, N.Y., in place of Elizabeth Zoeller, retired.
Marie L. Murray, Ellington, N.Y., in place of R. M. Seekins, retired.
George L. Nelson, Glen Head, N.Y., in place of J. T. McLaughlin, retired.
John W. Carroll, Jr., Great Neck, N.Y., in place of E. F. Higgins, retired.
Hugh E. Birdsrow, Lacona, N.Y., in place of G. C. Edick, retired.
John W. McCormick, Maine, N.Y., in place of I. E. Tymeson, retired.
Gerard R. T. O'Grady, Malverne, N.Y., in place of K. R. Brewer, retired.
Ruby L. Folds, Maple View, N.Y., in place of M. W. Newton, retired.
Joan C. Jendral, Mastic Beach, N.Y., in place of C. S. Jendral, deceased.
Dominic A. Amuso, Mount Kisco, N.Y., in place of Bernard Daley, retired.
Mary A. Jones, Oyster Bay, N.Y., in place of D. V. Walker, retired.
Ella N. DeLaire, Prospect, N.Y., in place of E. B. Dalley, retired.
Walter F. Schiener, Sardinia, N.Y., in place of M. C. Cudoba, deceased.
William B. Mackey, Schenectady, N.Y., in place of J. F. Connelly, deceased.
Victor W. Humel, Shirley, N.Y., in place of F. M. Landau, deceased.
Louis P. Kriss, West Islip, N.Y. Office established September 15, 1958.
Michael J. Taylor, Whitney Point, N.Y., in place of M. C. Wilcox, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

George B. Herndon, Fayetteville, N.C., in place of W. M. Shaw, retired.

OHIO

Frank I. Miller, Ada, Ohio, in place of V. W. Spellman, retired.
Kathryn E. Peters, Arcadia, Ohio, in place of L. M. Crawford, retired.
Herbert G. Wright, Grand Rapids, Ohio, in place of J. P. Minnick, retired.
Emmet F. Millard, Oregonia, Ohio, in place of R. E. Sherwood, retired.
Wesley D. Wickline, Rio Grande, Ohio, in place of L. A. Myers, retired.
Billy H. Ten Eyck, Vanburen, Ohio, in place of E. G. Duffield, retired.
Kenneth H. Haynes, Whitehouse, Ohio, in place of A. N. Weckerly, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Earl A. Moore, Boley, Okla., in place of L. L. Dolphin, retired.
William R. Kilgore, Sr., Idabel, Okla., in place of T. F. Bonner, deceased.

OREGON

Ned Palmer, Dayton, Oreg., in place of F. B. Willert, retired.
Vernon E. Stewart, Haines, Oreg., in place of M. E. Potter, retired.

Eva L. Albert, Trail, Oreg., in place of I. H. Howe, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Jack A. Lanager, Clearfield, Pa., in place of A. R. Hinkle, retired.
Daniel J. Gildea, Coaldale, Pa., in place of J. M. Donahue, deceased.
Richard D. Hetrick, Easton, Pa., in place of H. C. Schultz, retired.
Shirley G. Marmer, Frederick, Pa., in place of Howard Hasson, deceased.
George W. Nase, Tylersport, Pa., in place of N. W. Nase, resigned.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Ralph E. Edenfield, North Augusta, N.C. Office established October 2, 1961.

TENNESSEE

Gladys I. Price, Saint Bethlehem, Tenn., in place of C. B. Young, retired.
John E. Griffith, South Pittsburg, Tenn., in place of Lois McReynolds, retired.

TEXAS

Charlie T. Cummings, Alvarado, Tex., in place of E. P. Robinson, retired.
Marjorie W. Duncan, Bedias, Tex., in place of Lailie Griffith, retired.
A. Earl Beck, Dumas, Tex., in place of G. K. Denman, deceased.
Mary N. Barger, Goree, Tex., in place of E. L. Chamberlain, resigned.
Gilma C. Jones, Graford, Tex., in place of L. M. Dye, retired.
Maurice P. Long, Mount Vernon, Tex., in place of W. L. Nelson, deceased.
Preston R. Wheeler, Slaton, Tex., in place of T. E. McClanahan, retired.

VERMONT

Robert H. Lawrence, South Hero, Vt., in place of C. S. Joslyn, retired.

VIRGINIA

Annie D. Berry, Madison, Va., in place of E. S. Cave, retired.

WASHINGTON

Jean M. Olson, Manchester, Wash., in place of M. E. Randall, retired.
Dorothy E. Bjornsgaard, Rosburg, Wash., in place of L. H. Olson, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Cora M. Smith, Lost Creek, W. Va., in place of G. P. Rector, retired.
Clyde E. McClung, Reedy, W. Va., in place of M. C. Carpenter, retired.

WISCONSIN

Daniel A. Wirkus, Edgar, Wis., in place of F. J. Shortner, retired.
Raymond A. Austad, Hawkins, Wis., in place of F. W. Anderson, deceased.
Charles F. Held, Jackson, Wis., in place of A. W. Quade, deceased.
Irene L. Genisot, Montreal, Wis., in place of F. M. Kirby, retired.
Charles M. Bruner, Prentice, Wis., in place of C. A. Lundborg, retired.
Donald C. Tuttle, Suamico, Wis., in place of Ambrose Sheedy, deceased.
George P. Grabarec, Union Grove, Wis., in place of E. K. Sheen, retired.
Elmer F. Crowell, Wittenberg, Wis., in place of K. C. Meisner, retired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 4, 1963:

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

John Harold Fanning, of Rhode Island, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of 5 years expiring December 16, 1967, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

Dr. Francis Keppel, of Massachusetts, to be Commissioner of Education, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

LABOR DEPARTMENT

Daniel Patrick Moynihan, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Howard G. Gamser, of New York, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring February 1, 1966.

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

George C. Trevorrow, of Maryland, to be a member of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review for the remainder of the term expiring July 15, 1965.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

I. FOR CONFIRMATION OF RECESS APPOINTMENT

To be surgeons

David Frost	Paul G. Smith
Raymond T. Moore	Wesley W. Wieland
Patricia K. Roberts	

To be senior assistant surgeons

Scott I. Allen	Stuart C. Nottingham
Ronald L. McCartney	Raphael T. Nussdorf
William P. McElwain	S. David Rockoff
Will L. Nash	Bruce I. Shacker
Milton S. Nichaman	Leland L. Sprague

To be dental surgeon

Edward A. Graykowski

To be senior assistant dental surgeons

Richard R. Baker	James V. Petersen
Meade E. Butler	Keith J. Ryan
Richard Q. Dunn	John W. Topping, Jr.
Donald W. Johnson	Dale S. Pyke

To be senior sanitary engineer

John H. McCutchen

To be sanitary engineer

Theodore C. Ferris

To be assistant sanitary engineers

Oscar E. Dickason
Rodger L. Leupold
Albert C. Printz, Jr.

To be junior assistant sanitary engineers

Fred O. Bridges
Troy Marceleno
Walter S. Smith

To be senior assistant pharmacist

Robert Frankel

To be assistant pharmacists

Donald E. Hill
John J. Lucas
Donnie L. Powell

To be senior scientist

Richard B. Eads

To be scientist

Thomas W. Haines

To be senior assistant scientist

McWilson Warren

To be sanitarian

Francis J. Goldsmith

To be senior assistant sanitarians

Donald R. Johnston
Gerald J. Karches
Arthur L. Kenney

To be assistant sanitarians

Joseph Lovett
Thomas C. Rozzell

To be veterinary officer

Robert L. Rausch

To be senior assistant veterinary officer

Calvin E. Sevy

To be nurse officers

Agnes Des Marais
Mary J. McGee
Marjorie E. Myren

To be senior assistant nurse officer

Marion N. Keagle

To be senior assistant therapist

Gordon S. Pocock

To be assistant therapists

Richard S. Mazzacone

Herbert R. Pruett

To be health services officer

Viola L. Cunningham

II. FOR CONFIRMATION OF RECESS PERMANENT PROMOTION

To be senior assistant sanitary engineer

Richard D. Grundy

To be assistant sanitary engineer

William A. Felsing, Jr.

To be senior veterinary officer

Lauri Luoto

To be senior assistant nurse officer

Juanita M. Barkley

To be senior assistant health services officer

Martha G. Barclay

III. FOR APPOINTMENT

To be senior assistant surgeons

Morton G. Miller

Roger W. Schuler

To be senior assistant dental surgeons

Allen Doorn

Earl F. Pierce, Jr.

To be assistant sanitary engineers

John J. Henderson

Thomas C. Tucker

To be assistant therapists

C. Douglas Billion

James L. Witt

IV. FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION

To be senior assistant therapist

Richard S. Mazzacone

To be senior surgeon

Joseph C. Robinson

To be surgeon

Jerry C. Rosenberg

To be senior assistant surgeons

N. Burton Attico

John P. Blake

Ormond V. Brody

Rawser P. Crank, Jr.

Anthony N. Damato

Raymond A. Dieter, Jr.

Rodney G. Elliott

Frank P. Greene

Wallace H. Holthaus

James E. Maynard

Leslie G. Nelson

Thomas B. Stucker

Thomas B. Stucker

John Christfried J. Urner

To be senior assistant dental surgeons

Paul L. Beckley

Douglas G. Bell

William F. Bird

Clinton C. Cox

Stanford E. Ham-

burger

John S. Huling, Jr.

Val D. Jensen

Orlen N. Johnson

Sanford Krotenberg

Winslow B. Lee

Gene P. Lewis

Rollie W. Lyman

Glenn W. Smith

John J. Timmermans

To be assistant sanitary engineers

Francis M. McGowan

Donald W. Mantay

Francis G. Mattern

Donald G. Remark

Lowell A. Van Den Berg

To be junior assistant sanitary engineers

B. David Clark

Walter W. Liberick, Jr.

Edgar D. Preissner

To be assistant pharmacist

Henry W. Winship III

To be junior assistant pharmacist

James C. Yatsco

To be scientist

Samuel L. Buker

To be senior assistant sanitarians

John R. Bagby, Jr.

Harry Haverland

Wendall C. McElwee

Gene W. McElyea

To be assistant sanitarian

Gerald J. Lauer

To be veterinary officer

James R. Ganaway

To be senior assistant veterinary officers

Carl E. Miller

Robert D. Phemister

To be senior assistant dietitians

Lois R. Seidler

Betty J. Shuler

To be senior assistant therapists

John B. Allis

Thelma L. Reeder

To be assistant therapist

Gary L. Smidt

To be health services officer

David D. Haworth

To be senior assistant health services officer

Robert H. Bradford

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The 50th Anniversary of the U.S. Department of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, during the 50 years since its formal organization on March 4, 1913, the U.S. Department of Labor has faithfully and fully discharged its mission to "foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, to improve their working conditions, and to advance their opportunities for profitable employment." The Department has served equally both organized and unorganized labor in accordance with the best interests of the American people as a whole, and has been directly responsible for much beneficial change which has been achieved.

It is altogether fitting that we, as a nation, should pause to pay tribute to the U.S. Department of Labor as it marks the completion of a half-century of service in the public interest. As a member of the President's Committee for the Department of Labor 50th Anniversary Year, I am gratified to note that popular recognition of the meaningful contributions of the Department has been widespread and sincere. Citizens realize the importance and desirability of a well-

conceived and effective governmental agency staffed by experienced and dedicated experts who seek to promote healthy cooperation and justice in areas of labor-management concern.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and earlier, as a member of the Labor Committee in the House of Representatives under President Franklin D. Roosevelt and President Harry S. Truman, it has been my responsibility to aid in the drafting and passage of significant legislation designed to support the efforts of the Department of Labor and advance the well-being of American working men and women. Much has been achieved in creating safer and more healthful working conditions, workman's compensation and rehabilitation benefits, sound labor standards, unemployment insurance, impartial mediation, and many other functions which have created in America the healthiest working climate in the world.

During the New Deal administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, as a Member of the House of Representatives I was privileged to support a number of far-reaching measures which were instrumental in strengthening and raising the status of labor. Although trade unionism had been previously established in the United States it was under legislation of the New Deal era that the employer was first enjoined from interfering with the workers' right to organize; moreover, the employer was additionally obligated to recognize unions and to bargain with them in good faith. These provisions came into being under the Na-

tional Labor Relations Act of 1935, often termed the Magna Carta of labor, and was one of the New Deal's major contributions to economic and social justice.

Two other pieces of meaningful legislation enacted during this period were, the Government Contracts Act of 1936, and the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. The first required that persons employed by Government contractors must be paid not less than the standard minimum wage determined by the Secretary of Labor; while the latter established the principle of a universal floor under wages and a universal standard for hours in interstate commerce. It is interesting to note that the concept that the worker has the right to share in the benefits flowing from America's rising capacity to produce enjoyed its greatest legislative implementation during the New Deal.

And, it has become abundantly clear that the Department of Labor, through its many and diverse functions, has been instrumental in seeking more effective application of the Employment Act of 1946. This monumental piece of legislation was, according to the respected economist Gerhard Colm, "an expression of the peoples determination that appropriate Government policies would be used to avert depressions and unemployment. It was, in a way, an expression of confidence that a satisfactory economic performance could be accomplished within the framework of a free society; not through a policy of laissez faire, but through deliberate economic and fiscal measures."